

into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5116. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Military Appeals to review cases of certain individuals discharged from the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5117. A bill to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such spirits were in the possession of (1) the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulations, or (2) a wholesale or retail liquor dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5118. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5119. A bill providing for the insurance by the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation of membership shares in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5120. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an American National Arts Commission, and for the construction of a theater and opera house in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as "Citizenship Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 380. Resolution favoring certain action against the Government of Czechoslovakia unless John Hvasta, citizen of the United States is released from custody; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Res. 381. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5121. A bill for the relief of Felix Navedo Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5122. A bill for the relief of Claudio Gandola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 5123. A bill for the relief of Walter Huva and Lella Huva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 5124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan H. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 5125. A bill for the relief of Fong Way Chong, also known as Freddie Fong, and Chu Lau Hing, also known as Lana Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 5126. A bill for the relief of Lucian Roach, doing business as the Riverside Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5127. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleonora O. Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 5128. A bill for the relief of Michael Demcheshen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5129. A bill for the relief of Jose Vieira Alves De Melo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5130. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Connel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. Res. 383. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 3131) for the relief of Raymond B. Jeffrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

381. By the SPEAKER: Petition of San Joaquin County Disaster and Defense Council, Stockton, Calif., relative to civil defense funds to assist in the protection of local facilities and bases which are vital to the national defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

382. Also, petition of Prudencio, Sampaloc, Manila, Philippines, relative to a group of guerrillas known as the Third Sector, Usafe Liberty Crusade with headquarters in the city of Manila; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou great indwelling spirit, who art ever attempting to guide the spirit of man to the realization of abundant life, give us a greater sense of expectancy. Deliver us, we pray, from fears that paralyze the will, and from doubts that breed despair. Let us see Thee, the unchanging, secure foundation, upon which we continue to build a glorious heritage of freedom and fidelity. We need the insight of Thy Spirit and the all-pervading power of Thy love. To this end grant unto us the divine initiative that, as imitators of the Infinite, we may be bearers of light and abundant life to our age. Teach us to look upon our purpose and place in the sun with the same sense of mission of the One who staggered the world by the daringness of His faith, the Man of Galilee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 10, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3782) to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CORDON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considering labor-management relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, meeting jointly, were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Pierce Munsey, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a uniform Federal old-age pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Optimist International, at Detroit, Mich., relating to the principles of true democracy in the conduct of the government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution accepting the provisions of Public Law 681, Eighty-first Congress of the United States, relating to fish restoration and management projects

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

"Whereas under the provisions of Public Law 681, Eighty-first Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is empowered to cooperate with the States in fish restoration and management projects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the intent of the legislature to accept the provisions of Public Law 681, Eighty-first Congress of the United States, and that the Arizona Game and Fish Commission perform such acts, not in conflict with law, as may be necessary for the establishment and operation of cooperative fish restoration projects in compliance with such act and the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior thereunder."

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 10th instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, reported it on August 11, 1951, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 631) thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4601) to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 632) thereon.

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO FREE EUROPE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 56)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I submit a report on United States economic and military assistance to free Europe. This report sets forth the observations and conclusions of a subcommittee, of which I was chairman, which in July visited some seven European countries and received oral reports from American representatives in six additional countries.

This visit to Western Europe was undertaken at the invitation of General Eisenhower. The Foreign Relations Committee agreed with the general that it would be most helpful to it and to the Senate as a whole to obtain on-the-spot information as to the nature and scope of the European rearmament effort. We felt this information would be useful to the Senate in its consideration during this session of the mutual security assistance bill, S. 1762, which is now before the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, sitting jointly.

I hope that my colleagues will give this report careful study. There is much in-

formation in the report which has not been made available heretofore. There are, I believe, a number of important conclusions upon which the members of our nine-man bipartisan subcommittee agreed unanimously. It contrains, for example, carefully compiled figures showing the comparative cost of arming a soldier in Europe as compared with arming a soldier in the United States. It contains valuable information on the waning strength of communism and neutralism in Western Europe. It also contains some important conclusions on European morale.

While the trip of this subcommittee was hurried, I think we all found it extremely useful, both to our own country and to the countries we visited or heard from. In 14 days we conferred with the head of State, ranking Cabinet members, and the American Ambassadors in seven countries. We also conferred with American representatives from six other countries. This gave us a rare opportunity to assess the political pulse, as well as the economic condition and defense efforts of these states.

All our conferences with foreign officials were off the record. The things they said, however, helped the subcommittee to formulate its conclusions. Although we kept verbatim transcripts of our meetings with American officials in these countries, a great deal of that information also was highly classified. The committee staff is now in the process of editing these hearings so that the non-classified information may be made public for use during our consideration of the mutual security bill.

I want to commend the members of the subcommittee for their assiduous attention to their duties and for the unanimity of opinion which characterized their actions and found expression in this unanimous report of this bipartisan committee. They were most helpful to the chairman and it was indeed a pleasure to serve with Senators McMAHON, SPARKMAN, GILLETTE, WILEY, SMITH, HICKENLOOPER, LODGE, and BREWSTER.

I want also to extend my thanks to the Departments of State and Defense and to the members of the committee staff, who were most helpful to the subcommittee during its trip.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, without objection, printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1990. A bill for the relief of Rev. Milan Ignacio Hlebs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 1991. A bill relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces;

S. 1992. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status;

S. 1993. A bill to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 1994. A bill to authorize the use of the incomplete submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes; and

S. 1995. A bill to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Air Force of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 1996. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations in order to eliminate the provision requiring that a payment from a burial association shall be deducted from the burial allowance to a veteran; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 1997. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Shepherds Landing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1998. A bill for the relief of J. Hibbs Buckman and A. Raymond Raff, Jr., executors of the estate of A. Raymond Raff, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MARTIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4386, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON (for Mr. LEHMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LEHMAN to House bill 4386, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NATIONAL CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIO AND TELEVISION—AMENDMENT

Mr. BENTON (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1579) to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

TELEVISION FREQUENCY ASSIGNMENTS, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. BENTON (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) relating to television frequency assignments, construction of new stations, and television programming, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC.,
PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Discussion of the question "Should Spain be in the western alliance?" by himself and Senator MAGNUSON, on July 29, 1951, during broadcast of the Columbia Broadcasting System program, the People's Platform.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Correspondence between him and Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times, dealing with our China policy and Fred Uley's book entitled "The China Story."

By Mr. MARTIN:

Summary of remarks by him before the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh, Pa., August 10, 1951, on the subject of oaths of loyalty by American citizens.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Editorial entitled "NSRB Chairman," published in the Washington Post of August 11, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorials discussing the question of the stand of the United States toward communism, published in the Pittsburgh Press of August 9, 1951.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Editorial entitled "Industrial Dispersion," published in the Washington Post of August 13, 1951, and a release from the National Security Resources Board.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Hendrickson	McMahon
Benton	Hennings	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoyer	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Nixon
Cain	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Hunt	Pastore
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smathers
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Taft
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Welker
Gillette	McClellan	Williams
Green	McFarland	
Hayden	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senators from Indiana

[Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). A quorum is present.

PROTECTION OF LOYAL LABOR UNIONS
AGAINST INFILTRATION BY COMMUNISTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, last Thursday I introduced a bill (S. 975) having as one of its purposes the protection of loyal labor unions against infiltration by Communists and members of communistic organizations.

Key labor organizations are, at times, infiltrated by subversive persons who are members of Communist organizations and fronts, and whose activities disrupt normal peaceful relations and limit or embarrass the choice of loyal citizens in affiliating with loyal labor organizations.

I have the greatest admiration for the efforts of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO to purge their membership rolls of organizations which had been infiltrated and were dominated by Communist elements; and I believe that the legislation which I proposed last week, and which is intended to strengthen their hands, will have their full support.

I have had this problem under consideration for a long time, and have been trying to measure the effects of such legislation as I proposed last week in S. 975. I would not want to sponsor any proposal that would weaken the position of honest and loyal spokesmen for the millions of workmen whose might is the Nation's greatest defense asset.

I believe, however, that some additional legal protection is necessary for both the unions and the employers against the cancerous growth of communism which has threatened their stability.

The bill I have introduced would make it unlawful for any person who is a member of a Communist organization, or Communist-action organization, to become an officer or a representative of any labor organization.

It would withdraw bargaining privileges from any union represented by any such person.

In addition, it would permit an employer to discharge, without liability, any person who is listed in the records of an agency of the Federal or a State Government as a member of an organization designated by the Attorney General as subversive, or who has concealed his membership in such an or-

ganization or has refused to tell a properly constituted legislative committee whether or not he is or has been, knowingly or willingly, a member of such an organization.

Members of the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, have recently recommended that legislation be prepared authorizing withdrawal of any bargaining privileges held by Communist-dominated unions. I believe that if this is done, the other provisions which I have proposed in the bill which I introduced yesterday are necessary corollaries.

So that those of my colleagues who read the RECORD may be fully informed, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill which I introduced last Thursday, S. 975, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 975) to permit the discharge by employers of persons who are members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, and to decertify labor organizations represented by or having officers who are members of such organizations, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.) is amended by renumbering paragraph (15) as paragraph (16) and inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

"(15) Key labor organizations are at times infiltrated by subversive persons who are members of Communist organizations and fronts and whose activities disrupt normal peaceful labor relations and limit or embarrass the choice of loyal citizens in affiliating with loyal labor organizations."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as enacted in the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(g) It shall be unlawful for any person who is a member of a Communist organization, including any Communist-front organization or Communist-action organization, to be or to act as a representative or to be or to act as an officer of a labor organization within the terms of section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 137-138). Any certification heretofore issued under the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 143), with regard to any such person, or any labor organization having such a person as an officer or representative, is hereby declared void."

Sec. 3. Section 5 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as enacted in the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(d) Nothing in this act or any other statute of the United States shall preclude an employer from discharging without liability an employee who appears on the records, in the possession of the Federal Government or a State government, as a member of an organization designated by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive, or who has concealed his membership in such an organization, or who has refused to state to a duly constituted legislative committee whether or not he is or has knowingly or willingly been a member of such an organization."

ACTION ON HOUSE BILLS BY COMMITTEE
ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on a misconception which recurs with some frequency.

Every now and then we get complaints that the Judiciary Committee is not taking prompt action on House bills. Members of the House apparently are being told—by whom I do not know—that when bills come over from the House and are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, they are put in a pigeonhole and do not receive committee consideration. Of course, this is not even close to the truth. I have explained the situation to a number of individual Members of the other body, and yet the false reports persist. I really have no hope of allaying such reports permanently by the short statement I am now making; but at least it can do no harm to put the facts in the RECORD on this occasion.

So far this session, the Committee on the Judiciary has received 297 House bills. Of these 297 bills, 149—a full 50 percent—have been reported to the Senate. Seventy-three bills—approximately 25 percent—have been acted on adversely by the committee, and have been indefinitely postponed. This leaves only 75 bills out of 297 which have not yet been acted upon by the committee.

Mr. President, that is not the whole story; because 52 of those 75 bills upon which no action has been taken are bills which have come to the committee since May 1; that is, which have come to the committee within the period of approximately 90 days. In that 3-month period, the committee has received 126 House bills; and of these bills, 57 already have been reported to the Senate, and 17 have been acted upon adversely. This leaves, as I pointed out, 52 bills, out of the 126 received during the past 3 months, upon which no action has been taken.

Simple arithmetic will demonstrate that of 171 House bills which reached the Judiciary Committee of the Senate before May 1 of this year, all but 23 have been acted upon by the committee. That is less than 14 percent. To put it the other way, the record shows that of all the House bills which have been within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate for 90 days or longer, the committee has acted on more than 86 percent.

I make this statement so that our friends of the other body may know that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate not only has a fixed policy of seeking the promptest possible action on all House bills which come to the committee, but is effectuating that policy in its daily work.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GILLETTE,
OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation of the distinguished minority leader for his action last Thursday in presenting, in the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and myself, the resolution expressing the sorrow of the Senate over the death of Representative Wilson D. Gillette, who represented the Fourteenth District of Pennsylvania.

The passing of Wilson Gillette brings to me a profound sense of personal loss. He was my fine and loyal friend for many years. He served the people of his district with honor and distinction in the General Assembly of Pennsylvania for 10 years prior to his election to the Seventy-seventh Congress in 1941. He served in each succeeding Congress since that time.

Representative Gillette was a courageous and patriotic American. He served his State and Nation with complete fidelity to the highest principles of true Americanism. He was a tireless worker on behalf of his constituents.

He was a kindly, modest man, but was outstanding in integrity, sincerity, and devotion to the public welfare. He will be greatly missed by the people of his district and by his colleagues in the Pennsylvania delegation whom I join in deepest sympathy to his wife and family in their hour of bereavement.

DEATH OF STEPHEN T. EARLY

THE VICE PRESIDENT. I wish to express my profound regret and sorrow over the death of Stephen Early. I know I speak the sentiments of all of us who knew him and those who knew of him. I have known Mr. Early for a quarter of a century. He was an able and fair newspaper correspondent in Washington for years before he became press secretary at the White House under President Roosevelt. He later became connected with the Pullman Co., and latterly press secretary again on the death of Mr. Charles Ross. A more loyal, more patriotic American never served the people of this country in any capacity. I particularly deplore his death as a friend and associate. I have been requested to act as an honorary pallbearer at his funeral tomorrow, but because of a previous engagement with some ex-servicemen I shall be unable to perform that honorable mission. I did not want the opportunity to pass without paying my deep respects and my affectionate regard for this great American.

I wish his family and all his friends to know that not only do I entertain these sentiments about him, but I think we all entertain them.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in what the Vice President has said in regard to Stephen Early. The death of Steve Early is a great loss to America and to all of us. It is a tragedy that his career came to an end at a relatively early age. His many friends hoped that he would have many more years of active life.

It is unnecessary for me to recount his accomplishments and his brilliant service as Deputy Secretary of Defense and as press secretary to the late President Roosevelt and to President Truman. He served with high distinction and great devotion. He placed the welfare of his country above all.

As one who knew him for a long time, I feel a deep sense of personal grief. I wish to express my sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the re-

marks of the Vice President and the majority leader. I had known Steve Early for a number of years. Not only was he a very fine public servant but I counted him as one of my dearest friends. I shall miss him very much indeed. I wish to express my condolence to his family.

DEATH OF HERBERT K. WHITE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate noted with sorrow the death of Herbert White, Associated Press photographer, last Friday, in Rochester.

Herb White was one of the finest photographers in America, and he did a splendid job of covering the Senate when he came to Capitol Hill. He was a credit to the profession of journalism, and he will be sadly missed by his friends here in the Senate Chamber and in the Press Galleries.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy and condolence to his family.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also wish to join the majority leader in an expression of regret at the passing of Herb White. Herb White was one of the finest photographers and journalists we had on the Hill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in company with so many others of his good friends in the Senate, I was profoundly shocked to learn of Herbie White's sudden and untimely death last Friday.

Herbie White was known to all of us as the ever-present photographer representing the Associated Press.

Herbie's first mission was to get the picture. He always did. But he was very courteous in the way he did it.

That is what made him outstanding in his own profession, as did the exceptional quality of his work. In exhibitions of the work of photographers of the White House and Capitol Hill his work always stood out for its exceptional quality.

But Herbie White was a great deal more than a photographer. He was a friend. No matter what the pressure of his duties it was always possible for him to find the time to exchange pleasantries and commentary. It was his commentary that inevitably added spice to our daily work. His observations were always keen and piercing, although never unkind.

Herbie White was a great credit to a craft and a profession which is of vital importance in our system where the news is to be reported fairly, promptly, and accurately so that the public may be enlightened and thereby exercise their guiding judgment in the conduct of our Nation's affairs. Pictures are an essential feature of that process because it has been said that one picture tells more than 10,000 words. Herbie White's pictures never failed to tell the story.

I want to pay this personal tribute to Herbie White and to say that I will miss him greatly. My sincere regrets go out as well to his wife and family.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a couple of minutes?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who serves on the

Committee on Appropriations and who has rendered very valuable service. If I may, I should like to say that 35 or 40 years ago I served in the House of Representatives with his distinguished father. He was one of the best men I have ever known, and his son is like unto him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Tennessee. At a later time I expect to talk on the pending bill. However, I rose to say something relative to the passing of Herbert White, who died on Saturday. He was an Associated Press photographer who covered Washington. Mr. White was a young man. He had just passed his forty-third birthday anniversary. He was born in Washington and had worked with the Associated Press since 1932, first gaining newspaper experience with the Washington Times-Herald. During the period of the Second World War he served in the Navy. He returned to civilian life and participated in the activities of Washington as a newspaper photographer and interpreter to the Nation of activities in the Nation's Capital.

As an alert and aggressive newspaper photographer he had many assignments on presidential campaign trains, covering both the campaigns of President Roosevelt and President Truman, also covering the great national conventions. In more recent times his specific assignment with the Associated Press had been the covering of the Senate of the United States.

I believe many of us were fortunate in having had an opportunity not only of seeing his work as a competent photographer and member of the fourth estate, but as one who was both alert in his work and friendly in his dealings with those with whom he came in contact. I know that I speak for many Members of the Senate who had the opportunity of knowing Herbert White when I say that he will be missed in Washington.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, one of the most beloved members of the Senate press and photographers' corps, Herbert K. White, died last Friday in Rochester, N. Y., after a heart attack.

We all knew him as "Herbie" White, a man with a camera who had the common touch, who knew everybody, liked everybody, and was a friend to the high and the low.

Mr. President, I am impressed by the number of people who have stopped me to talk about the passing of Herbie White. He is genuinely mourned not only by Senators, but by the policeman at the door, the elevator operators, and the messengers at the Capitol. They are the people who have the opportunity to judge the real worth of a man and they are unanimous in their high judgment of him.

Herbie White is gone, but his kindness and his friendships will live long in his wake.

Mr. President, Herbie White was one of those rare persons, a native Washingtonian. He was graduated from Central High School in 1927, and went to work for the Washington Times-Herald as an apprentice.

He joined the Associated Press about 1931 and covered the Capitol. It is a compliment to all of us here that Herbie White was known among his colleagues as "The Senator."

When World War II came, Herbie White was in the thick of it with his camera. He was the first photographer to land on the beach in the invasion of Sicily.

Transferred to Panama, he later was sent to the Dutch West Indies. There he was, as he expressed it, "bowled out of bed" one morning by submarine attacks on Aruba, the oil center.

Besides covering the Senate, Herbie White rode the presidential campaign trains, picturing political developments as they occurred.

Mr. President, I have lost a personal friend. Many other Senators have lost a personal friend. The Senate itself has lost a beloved friend. We mourn his passing.

As I feel the great vacuum around Capitol Hill caused by the death of one of the finest friends I have had, I recall to mind the eulogy pronounced by Clarence Darrow over the grave of one of his friends. It is so long since I read it that I cannot quote Darrow verbatim, but roughly here is the thought:

The sun shall never shine so bright again,
The stars shall never gleam so white again,
The autumn leaves have lost some of their
old-time tint of red and brown.
The world shall never seem so good again—
For another great man is dead.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the August 9 issue of the American Aviation Daily there appears an article which should enlist the attention of committees of Congress, especially the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The article is headed "Air traffic control—Tragedy in the making." I shall read the first paragraph of the article and invite the attention of my colleagues to the entire article. I read the first paragraph:

The record-making performance and safety of operation by the airlines of the United States stands little chance of "weathering" the coming fall and winter. The delays, cancellations, and even accidents which plagued airline operation in 1946-47 might well mark the 1951-52 winter season.

There follow some very carefully analyzed and pointed statements which in my opinion should receive immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL—TRAGEDY IN THE MAKING

The record making performance and safety of operation by the airlines of the United States stand little chance of "weathering" the coming fall and winter. The delays, cancellations, and even accidents which plagued airline operation in 1946-47 might well mark the 1951-52 winter season.

The remarkable achievements of the industry during the past 5 years in overcoming the operational problems posed by all-weather flying are right now being undermined in a manner and to a degree which

makes a recovery this year seem difficult if not impossible.

This is the result of the wholesale military recall of airport and air traffic controllers who last month handled more than a million fixed postings, on the Federal Airways. It is not purely a civil problem. More than 300,000 of these fixed postings were military. Also, between 15-20 percent of the landings and take-offs at all 175 tower-controlled civil airports are made by military airplanes. Already the military have had to cancel mass training flights as a direct result of Federal Airways personnel shortages.

EXPERIENCE LEVEL DROPPING

In region I, including the high density New York-Boston-Washington area, 62 percent of the controllers now directing traffic have had less than 1 year in their present grades. In this 62 percent are 87 with less than 3 months in grade and 38 more with less than 6 months. Of the airport controllers in this region, 37 percent have less than 1 year on their present jobs. Of this 140 airport controllers, 58 have less than 3 months' experience in grade.

Of 1,551 authorized air route traffic controllers, 150 have been recalled since June 1950. Twenty-seven have been deferred and 32 more are scheduled for recall before December. Of those remaining, 209 are in the Active Reserves, 407 Inactive Reserves.

There are 1,846 authorized airport controller positions. Of these, 109 have been recalled to service, 12 are deferred, and 17 are scheduled to go before the end of the year. One hundred and thirty-five of those remaining are in the active Reserve, and 337 are in the inactive Reserves. The situation is almost as bad with communications men and electronic technicians.

RESERVISTS FOR REPLACEMENT

Replacements for these men have to come from the Civil Service register, where veterans get preference. The result is that replacements have already raised the number of reservists in these positions to a point above the level when the recalls were initiated. Attempts to bypass the civil-service register have been unsuccessful.

This country is building a billion-dollar traffic-control system scheduled for completion after 1960. Millions spent to date have been invested in equipment aimed at bringing immediate relief to the Nation's congested airways. Automatic operation has been sacrificed to gain time. This is the transition system, for a period during which the related sciences required for automatic control are being developed.

The human being is the key to today's air traffic control. He is aided by a vast array of mechanical and electronic aids which require intelligent and informed monitoring and interpretation. When this is missing, the system breaks down. And the system has broken down. On three separate occasions in the past few months, months during which weather offers no real problems, the system has bogged down hopelessly in critical areas. In the first case, typical of all three instances, some 20 scheduled operations by the Strategic Air Command had to be cancelled. At the same time one airline had 51 flights delayed over 5 hours and another 17 flights delayed more than 9 hours.

Both civil and military traffic on the airways is increasing and the defense planners are scheduling even greater responsibilities for this group in the event of further mobilization. No solution is in sight.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973)

making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. STIGLER, Mr. BATES of Kentucky, Mr. CANNON, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2736) to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3911) to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

CIVIL-FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday last, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 4386, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall be pleased if Senators will listen to what I have to say. I shall be brief.

I wish to point out that the bill affects nearly every State of the Union. Before going into the various items of appropriations contained in the bill reported to the Senate last Saturday by the Senate Appropriations Committee, I desire to make a general statement concerning the bill and the difference between the Senate version and the House version of the bill. From this statement, I hope Senators may see a little more clearly the differences between the two versions of the bill.

The House passed the bill in the early part of June, and it came to the Senate. The Senate committee has been considering the bill very vigorously and very actively ever since then. I hold in my hand a copy of the printed hearings, and the size of this volume indicates the immense amount of testimony which has been taken in regard to every item in the bill.

The bill as passed by the House appropriates \$514,427,000 for civil functions. The Senate committee has reported the bill to the Senate in the amount of \$637,-

278,213, or a difference of \$122,850,813. Of that amount, however, \$21,215,000 was recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget after the Kansas floods. The House did not pass on that item at all. Deducting the item of \$21,215,000, the difference between the two versions of the bill is \$101,635,813. In other words, the Senate committee voted to increase the appropriations made by the House of Representatives in the amount of \$101,635,813, making a total of \$627,278,213. I ask Senators to keep those figures in mind, in view of what I shall discuss almost immediately.

At first sight, Mr. President, this seems to be an enormous increase, being a little less than a 20-percent increase. However, when we come to consider the facts as they exist, I am constrained to believe that the Senate will take the same view that its Appropriations Committee has taken.

I wish to point out the differences. There are five main differences between the House version and the Senate committee's version of the bill.

1. PLANNING MONEY

The first one is what is known as planning money. Dams cannot be built on rivers without having plans made beforehand. Reservoirs cannot be built without having plans made beforehand. Planning money is most important, of course.

Both during my experience in the Congress and before then, planning money for the Corps of Engineers has been appropriated before dams or reservoirs were begun. The planning money recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for 1952, including that carried in the supplemental budget received last week, amounted to \$3,700,000. The House voted to eliminate all appropriations for planning money; the House voted to stop planning entirely, so far as this bill is concerned.

When the bill reached the Senate committee under those circumstances, Mr. President, we felt that the elimination of appropriations for planning was unwise. That was the attitude of not merely one member of the committee, but of a majority of the committee. In fact, I think the vote was 18 to 4, if I recall the figures correctly. On this particular item, there was no division at all.

Think of it a moment, Mr. President: the United States Government is giving to nations scattered over almost all the world vast sums of money. This bill, as it is reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee, calls for appropriations of \$637,278,213. By way of contrast, what is proposed to be given by the United States to the other nations of the world, by means of action proposed to be taken at this session of Congress? The total is \$8,500,000,000. Will no planning money be provided in that measure? Oh, no; considerable sums of the money the United States provides to foreign nations in that bill are to be used for planning; the United States Government furnishes money for planning for great projects all over the world. No limitation is imposed in that respect. During the present year, all kinds of great works will be planned.

Yet, while we provide the funds for the planning of projects in virtually all the other countries of the world, the House has determined that the United States should not use planning money for any purpose in connection with projects in the United States, and the House voted to eliminate from the bill all appropriations of planning money.

Mr. President, as I have said, the planning money recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for 1952, including that carried in the supplemental budget which was received last week, amounts to \$3,700,000, of which \$1,000,000 is for rivers and harbors and \$2,700,000 is for flood control. The House voted to eliminate those appropriations from the bill.

Mr. President, as I have suggested, the United States Government furnishes money for nations of Africa and Asia and South America and virtually all other areas of the world; and planning money is provided for projects in those foreign countries, as I shall point out in a moment. But in America, according to the House, planning money is excluded. I do not believe there is a single Senator who will not say that the Senate committee was entirely justified when it voted for the restoration of \$3,700,000 of planning money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator wait a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall then be glad to yield to him. At this point I merely wish to show how it operates. I shall refer to one illustration in particular, though there are many illustrations which could be used. I note by the morning press that the Economic Cooperation Administration has drawn a contract with three engineering firms, who are to make a study in connection with projects of this kind in Burma. It is proposed to put a stop to it in the United States, but we furnish the money with which to begin the planning of similar great projects in Burma. Mr. President, think of it for a moment. An appropriation of \$3,700,000 is sought for use in our own country, and the House refuses to provide it, but ECA proposes to furnish \$1,500,000 for planning money in Burma.

I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico in a moment. I am sure he will agree with me. I wonder whether there is a Senator in this body who would say that we ought to furnish planning money for Burma and Liberia. I noticed in the press yesterday that a large amount is to be spent to increase electrical generation in Liberia, in Afghanistan, and in various other countries; but when it comes to planning money for America the House says, "No; we are going to stop it; we are going to effect a saving." I do not believe there is a Senator who will say that we ought to stop it. Those who saw fit to deny planning money for American projects raise no question as to the necessity of planning money for foreign projects.

The total estimates for the Corps of Engineers, civil functions, amount to \$646,059,843; all of which, of course, is

classified in some quarters as pork-barrel funds; and the House made a 20-percent cut. But last year the House conferees fought the Senate conferees with the utmost vigor, trying to insure an appropriation of \$2,500,000,000 for the Economic Cooperation Administration in order that adequate plans might be made in Burma and elsewhere. I now yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In line with what the Senator from Tennessee has been saying on the subject of planning money, is it not a fact that, unless we provide planning money for use within the United States, it will in the future be impossible for the United States to give money to Burma or to any other country in the world?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, that is so; and that is why I said a moment ago that I do not believe there is a Senator who will vote against this amendment when his name is called. I yield further to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the over-all picture, is it not a fact that, after weeks of hearings by the subcommittee, during which time they listened to the justification of the various items of this bill, and after weeks of hard work, under the leadership of the Senator from Tennessee, and notwithstanding the fact that the amount is increased by the Senate committee to the extent of \$122,000,000, it is still under the 1952 estimate by \$25,000,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not also a fact that, even after weeks of deliberations and hearings, the total amount for the items submitted by the Senate committee is still more than \$8,000,000 less than the 1951 appropriation?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct. I wish to say here and now that I am one of those old-fashioned men who believe that Senators and Representatives are elected by the people for the purpose of legislating in the interest of America first. If we can assist our neighbors and extend charity to them at times, well and good. But I do not believe in the doctrine that we should turn over unlimited sums of money for the purpose of furthering projects abroad, while we deny similar projects to our own people. I doubt whether it is constitutional. It may be said by some that the Constitution is an old-fashioned doctrine and that no one should pay any attention to it in these days. I am still old-fashioned enough to believe in the Constitution. I also believe in America, and I believe in America first. I believe America comes first as against all other nations.

Mr. President, I come now to a discussion of the sum of \$3,700,000 for planning. In this connection I desire to speak a word about projects which are under construction.

2. PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Projects now under construction are the Buford Dam in Georgia, the Albeni Falls Reservoir in Idaho, the Red River of the North in Minnesota, the Jemez-Hamus-Canyon Reservoir in New Mexico, the Cheatham lock and dam in

Tennessee, St. Anthony Falls in Minnesota, and the Oahe Reservoir in South Dakota, for which there was a request from the Bureau of the Budget for a total of \$20,770,000. These projects have already been let out to contractors and all of them are partially completed and some of them are more than half completed. The Government has a contract with various contractors to build these projects, and that contract provides that if the Government stops work on them the Government will pay the contractors the cost of stopping the work. General Pick, Chief of Engineers, and many other witnesses from the Corps of Engineers say that it will cost one-third of the entire amount, namely, one-third of the \$20,770,000, to stop that work. The contractors will have to discharge their forces. They must either give up their equipment or leave it exposed to the weather. Their whole organization will be disrupted. Who will pay for it? The contractor? Not at all. The United States Government will pay for it, and one-third of the \$20,770,000, or approximately \$7,000,000, will simply be lost by the Government, in the event the Government does not go ahead with the project.

In other words, while we are building dams and reservoirs and other such projects in foreign countries, with no limitation of any kind, nature, or description—and I have no doubt we will continue building them, certainly if the ECA bill passes—it is proposed to stop such work in our own country. Is that right or just? Is that fair to our own people? I think it is not.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The able and distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee made reference to the item in the appropriation bill of \$1,500,000 for the improvement of the upper harbor on the Mississippi River at Minneapolis. That construction is under way at this time, and railroad bridges are being moved. In the event the appropriation should not be made for the continuance of this project we would have to replace the railroad bridges or reconstruct them. It would be necessary to spend at least a million dollars or possibly a million and a quarters dollars to reestablish the bridges, as well as other construction which has been torn down in order to construct the locks and the dam. For that reason, Mr. President, the committee felt it was wiser to continue the construction of the locks in the harbor than to replace bridges.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct. Not only is it proposed to stop work so far as these seven dams and reservoirs are concerned, but we are penalizing the American Government tremendously in order to stop the work. For my part and for the committee's part—and the vote in the committee was overwhelming—I think it would be discriminating against the United States to furnish money for the fiscal year 1952 to continue projects now under construction in foreign countries, and do nothing in our own country.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I am sure every Member of the Senate is impressed with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and the vigor with which he is pressing his case. It was my privilege to serve on the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House for a number of years.

Mr. McKELLAR. I recall it well.

Mr. CASE. I also wish to commend the action of the chairman and the committee on the presentation of the need for continuing construction on the Missouri River. The committee recognizes the realities of the situation, and, in approving the continuation of the program as outlined by the Army engineers, is doing what it can to bring to fruition a comprehensive plan for the control of the Missouri River.

The disastrous floods in Kansas City and St. Louis are evidence of the fact that the sooner the program is completed the sooner people will have protection from such disasters. The committee has approved the Fall River Basin, Fort Randall Reservoir, and Oahe Reservoir in South Dakota and North Dakota. The action of the committee in its realistic approach to the subject is worthy of the attention of the whole country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I thoroughly and wholeheartedly agree with the position he is taking on the floor with reference to the pending bill. It was the kindness of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee that permitted the reopening of certain phases of the hearings at the time of the flood situation in Kansas.

I note with particular satisfaction and pride that the State of Kansas was included in the committee's consideration of the pending measure, including the Hutchinson project, the Strawn Reservoir, the Topeka project, the Toronto Reservoir, and the Turtle Creek Reservoir.

I noted what the Senator had to say about the planning money. I note that the committee has considered the appropriation of planning money for one of the projects to the extent of \$250,000. I think that is a most constructive step. I think the committee has done a magnificent job.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas with all my heart.

Mr. President, we have already accounted for more than \$25,000,000 of the increase in the bill made by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I come next to new projects. We have four new starts or new projects in the bill. For what purpose were they recommended by the President? They are four projects from which additional electricity for war purposes primarily is intended to be obtained. The four new

projects were recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers, by the President, and by the Bureau of the Budget. They all say the projects will be of vital necessity in the event we continue to have trouble in the east. I wish to state what the projects are, and how much they amount to.

They are the Dalles lock and dam in Oregon, \$18,000,000; the Ice Harbor lock and dam in Washington State; \$4,000,000; Old Hickory Dam in Tennessee, \$8,000,000; Gavins Point Reservoir in Nebraska, \$5,000,000.

The total budget estimate for these projects is \$35,000,000. But the Senate committee reduced the budget estimate by \$6,500,000. The projects I have mentioned account for the greater portion of the increase in the appropriation. The Dalles lock and dam project was reduced by \$4,000,000. The Old Hickory lock and dam project in Tennessee was reduced by \$2,000,000. The Gavins Point Reservoir project was reduced by \$500,000.

Mr. President, we are furnishing money to build new projects to countries that we call friends, but some of them are not showing the friendship which I think they ought to show. However, according to the House bill, we must absolutely refuse to build any new projects at home. We must eliminate them. America must supply money to all the other countries of the world, but must not build new projects, such as hydro-electric projects or dams, which would repay to the Government every cent of the money spent in their construction. There can be no question about that. Some of our leading dams are now paying the Government back.

It may be asked why new projects were started. They were started for the reasons which I have stated. If the ECA bill passes, vast sums of money for the same kinds of projects in other countries will be provided. There will be no prohibition against building new projects in other countries, while in America "no new projects" is the word. I did not vote for the first ECA bill. My colleagues outvoted me. However, I accepted it. We are trying to make the best of it. We are trying to be kind to all the world. We are trying to do the right thing to all the world. But we hear the slogan, "no new projects." Is that right? Is it right to throw our people out of employment, and discontinue projects, at an enormous cost to the Government?

As I have previously stated, I voted against the first ECA bill. I have always doubted the wisdom of our giving money to foreign countries under the conditions which now exist in the world. But, as I have said, I accepted the majority views of my colleagues, and we have been trying to get along. I thought—and a very large majority of the committee thought—that the four dams and reservoirs to which I have referred ought to be provided for.

We come to the next item, for "Surveys and examinations." Before dams or reservoirs can be built there must be examinations. We cannot simply look at the map and say that we are going to build a dam in Indiana, Idaho, Mississippi or some other State. The project

must be investigated. The amount involved for this item is very small. It is only \$6,000,000. The House eliminated it entirely. Ought we to put it back? It is proposed to stop the enormous works which we have been constructing along this line for many years? I say that that is not right. If we can furnish money for exploration and surveys in foreign countries, why should we stop making appropriations for surveys in our own country?

The last item is in connection with the Kansas and Missouri floods. One day a few weeks ago we were taking testimony concerning the building of three dams in northern Kansas. General Pick, the Chief of Engineers, was the principal witness. He earnestly argued in favor of what is known as the Tuttle Creek Reservoir and Dam in Kansas. This was before the floods came. This was before the levees broke. We found that that dam had been authorized for several years, but because of local differences the dam had not been built.

A remarkable thing occurred. I digress here long enough to mention it. The day before the flood came we were examining General Pick. General Pick said that if the Tuttle Creek Dam had been built as the Congress had directed, there would have been no Kansas City flood. He explained his reasons. In my judgment, there is not a doubt that if the Tuttle Creek Dam had been built we would not have had to spend \$25,000,000 to help the flood sufferers in Kansas and Missouri.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, let me say of General Pick that he is my kind of man. He was testifying on the afternoon before the flood. He heard of the great tragedy in Kansas City. Did he send a staff member out there to see about it? Did he send a subordinate, as he might have done, to see about it? Not at all. He went himself, and stayed there until he found out all about it, and what could be done to help remedy the situation. The Congress literally spent \$25,000,000 to aid people who suffered so greatly from the flood. It was not our purpose to pay them for all the damage, of course, but merely to relieve suffering.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for bringing in this fine report, affecting as it does some of our domestic problems. I appreciate very much his statement as to our attitude in regard to taking care of our own people. I expect to devote some time to a discussion of the pending legislation when I obtain recognition in my own right this afternoon or tomorrow during the course of the debate.

However, I wish to say that we in Kansas and the Missouri Basin are indebted to the Senator from Tennessee and the other members of the Appropriations Committee for recommending funds for plans for preliminary studies, and for the commencement of some new

projects, which are so vital in a program of flood protection and the control of the water runoff in the Missouri Basin.

We have gone through what I am told is one of the most disastrous floods in the Nation's history. The damage in the Kansas River Basin has amounted to a billion dollars. It will be decades before the economic losses suffered because of the flood will be overcome.

When I enter into a general discussion of the subject in my own time I expect to dwell at length on some of the problems. Again let me say that we are deeply indebted to the Senator from Tennessee for his many courtesies and kindnesses.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appreciate the kind words of the Senator.

Mr. President, just think what we would have saved if the plan of the Engineers had been carried out. We would have saved \$25,000,000 in cash, which we appropriated for relief during the last flood. I am afraid that there will be some opposition to increasing this appropriation \$100,000,000. However, we must remember that a \$21,000,000 item was brought in after the Kansas flood. In my judgment the committee did its full duty in appropriating the additional \$100,000,000.

Of course, some people always think there is "pork" in every bill of this kind. There is no "pork" in it, Mr. President. The bill concerns the building up of our country. I do not know of any other country which has been built up as much as has our country in the past few years by the use of Federal money in constructing dams and in creating reservoirs in the great West, where untillable land has been made tillable and where deserts have been brought under cultivation. Some wonderful work has been done.

Mr. President, just one further word. Our committee has worked on the bill since the 28th day of June, as I recall. We have taken the testimony which I showed the Senate a moment ago, consisting of 1,634 pages. We have carefully and honestly considered every item in the bill. I want to say to the Senate that I very greatly hope that the bill can be passed at the earliest possible moment. I hope that if we cannot put ourselves on the same basis, at least we can place the United States in a secondary position to other nations of the world to whom we are literally shoveling out money to the extent of \$8,500,000,000 to be used as they please, while at the same time the construction of great dams in our country has been stopped.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Under the customary procedure of the Senate, committee amendments will be first considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to join the other Members of the Senate in expressing my appreciation to the eminent chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the hard work he has done on this bill and the careful

consideration which he and all other members of the committee have given to the subject.

As the Senator from Tennessee has stated, the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee calls for an increase in the amount of \$123,000,000 in the appropriations voted by the House of Representatives. This is an increase from \$514,000,000 to \$637,000,000. I suppose that the practical reason for the voting of that increase by the committee was the great flood which began in Kansas in July and swept on through Kansas and down the Missouri River and down the Mississippi River. Although this was not particularly mentioned in the report, probably as a practical matter, it was that great flood which led to the increase which the committee voted in the appropriations.

I am sure that the committee has been careful in the consideration which it has given to the bill. The committee has wished to protect itself against a charge that if it did not recommend such appropriations and if a flood came in the future, the fault might be that of the committee. I suppose all of us feel a certain sense of solemnity about this subject, lest we fail to take steps which might prevent future floods.

So, Mr. President, I fully appreciate the position of the committee, and I do not desire in any sense to reproach the committee for the attitude it has taken. I do not wish to set myself up as superior in knowledge in any degree to the committee.

However, Mr. President, I think there are certain other considerations which we should bear in mind. I shall try to be brief in mentioning them.

MUCH OF COMMITTEE INCREASE IS NOT FOR FLOOD CONTROL

In the first place, \$50,000,000 of the \$123,000,000 of increase are not connected in any direct sense with flood control, but are included in the recommended appropriations for rivers and harbors primarily navigation projects, and will not give any immediate protection against floods.

In the second place, it still is not certain whether the so-called Pick-Sloan plan, or the shotgun marriage of the plan of the Corps of Army Engineers and the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Missouri Valley, is the best way to control floods in that area. It is my own feeling that the Pick-Sloan plan should be modified so as to provide for a greater number of small retention dams in the tributary rivers, to check the flow of water as it comes into the rivers; and, secondly, I believe that the entire program of flood control could perhaps more properly be directed at upstream control, and reforestation, the re-seeding of barren hillsides, the development of grasses which will retain moisture, contour plowing, terracing, and in general what is known as upstream engineering.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT FLOOD CONTROL IMPOSSIBLE

I think we must also bear in mind that probably no system, however effective, could have prevented the floods in Kansas. There we had an almost unique ex-

perience, namely, 30 days of extremely heavy rainfall, followed by 1½ days during which the rainfall amounted to as much as 11 inches, as I recall.

Mr. President, during the last war I spent some time in the South Pacific, and a portion of the time I was on the western part of the island of New Britain, which has one of the heaviest rainfalls in the world, amounting to approximately 365 inches a year. This compares with the 33 inches in Chicago and from 20 to 25 inches on an average, I believe, in Kansas. One day in New Britain there was a rainfall of 14 inches. I never want to see anything like that again. I know that a rainfall of from 10 to 14 inches in one day on the Great Plains creates an amount of water which is virtually uncontrollable, but it probably occurs only once in a century in any part of our country.

So, although we realize and deprecate the damage which has been caused, and although we wish to protect ourselves against future damage, I think we must also consider the factor that if we were to protect every area of the United States against the possibility of a flood such as the one which occurred in Kansas, we would have to cover the country and construct in all its streams the most elaborate set of dams and precautionary works, the cost of which probably would run into the tens and tens of billions of dollars. In other words, try as hard as we may, there are some catastrophes against which man cannot provide.

AN INFLATIONARY FLOOD CAN BE DISASTROUS, TOO

Mr. President, I quite well realize how the fear of another possible flood impressed the committee itself. As I have said, I wish to pay tribute to the committee's motives. I, too, am afraid of another flood. However, not only am I afraid of a flood of water, but I am also afraid of a flood of inflation which might sweep over the country and might take away, not the topsoil, but the middle class and the economic stability of the Nation. So, the fiscal condition of the country compels us to examine carefully each and every appropriation with which we are confronted and to deal with it in terms of the general budgetary situation which we have to face.

So far as I can see, the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1951-52 is at least \$12,000,000,000 and more probably \$20,000,000,000 in the red. I should like to justify those figures, if I may.

In January the President sent to Congress a budget calling for appropriations of \$71,500,000,000. Since then, the President has sent to Congress a request for a further appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for foreign aid. The total requests which have come to us from the administration amount, at a conservative estimate, to approximately \$73,000,000,000 of expenditures for the coming year. I know there is some uncertainty about the totals, particularly in connection with national defense, because we are being asked to appropriate for national defense large sums of money which it is said will not be spent during the coming year, and, therefore, in those cases the appropriation perhaps approaches

an authorization, rather than an actual expenditure. Nevertheless, Mr. President, if we are most charitable by saying that of the \$56,000,000,000 of appropriations voted last week by the House of Representatives for national defense, only from \$40,000,000,000 to \$41,000,000,000 will be spent, there are still large items which the weight of probability indicates, so far as I can ascertain, will be above and in addition to those figures.

INCREASED MILITARY SPENDING IN PROSPECT

In that connection I should like to mention the large program for the construction of military bases abroad—a very necessary program, in my judgment, and one which will run into the billions of dollars in expense, and which may be accelerated far beyond present plans. If it is accelerated in speed, of necessity it will call for much larger expenditures during the coming year than now are contemplated.

We also have "in the works" the possibility of enlarging the Air Force from the present budgeted figure of 95 groups to a total of possibly 135 groups or, as others have advocated, 150 or even 163 groups. If that program is carried through, there will have to be further appropriations and expenditures in the amount of additional billions of dollars.

Then we have the question of the Korean war. It is my understanding that the present budgetary figures are predicated on the assumption that the Korean war expenditures will be liquidated by the end of this year, and that virtually no allowance is made for the continuation of hostilities beyond the end of December. Mr. President, that is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but I think it is very uncertain that we can count on it. If we merely carry on at the present rate that will be at a monthly added cost of from four to five hundred million dollars or a yearly total of about \$5,000,000,000.

Therefore, from all these sources—military bases, expansion of the Air Force, continuation of the Korean war, and other items—I think we can look forward to the fact that the governmental expenditures for the coming year will be not the \$71,500,000,000 which the administration requested in January, or the \$73,000,000,000 of requests, or the \$68,400,000,000 which I understand the assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget stated on June 29 before the Senate Finance Committee was his estimate of the expenditures, but in all probability at least \$80,000,000,000, and perhaps more.

PROSPECTIVE REVENUES INADEQUATE TO STOP INFLATION

What do we have on the income side, Mr. President? The Treasury sent to us in January an estimate of the fiscal yields for 1951-52. The Treasury then estimated that the yield of present taxes during the present fiscal year would be approximately \$55,000,000,000. I consider that to be an underestimate; I think the national income has increased appreciably more than the Treasury believed it would increase at the time when the Treasury made its estimate. Furthermore, there has been an increase, not merely in real in-

come, but in the general price level, and that will increase the amount of the total receipts.

Some weeks ago, I made an estimate that the expected yield of present taxes for the fiscal year 1951-52 would be approximately \$61,000,000,000. I was interested in learning this morning that the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, working independently, had reached an estimate almost identical with that of mine. They fixed the estimated yield at \$61,400,000,000. Of course, there is a certain margin of error in both estimates.

Nevertheless, the contrast between the \$80,000,000,000, which I submit is our likely expenditure, and the sum of \$61,000,000,000, which we have in sight, leads to a staggering deficit of \$19,000,000,000. It may be reasoned that the deficit may be only \$12,000,000,000, but, on the other hand, it may be more than \$19,000,000,000.

Mr. President, what will happen if we have a deficit of this magnitude? In the old days, what happened was that the Government printed additional money to make good the deficit, and there was an immediate increase in the quantity of money in circulation; and that meant an increase in prices. That, in large part, was the history of the Civil War; and was what caused so much trouble in the Civil War. I may say there was inflation in the North and the inflation in the South equally damaging both civilizations and both sections of the country.

Nowadays, however, we act in a somewhat more sophisticated fashion. The Government does not issue the money outright, but it goes to the banks to borrow money, because, with a deficit of \$19,000,000,000, we cannot expect the people of the country to save that amount out of their income; while a portion of the \$19,000,000,000 can perhaps be derived from savings, the major portion will have to be obtained from the banks.

DEFICIT WILL CAUSE CREATION OF CHECKBOOK MONEY

What will happen? The Treasury will go to the banks and ask them to make loans to the Government of a certain percentage of their capital and surplus. The banks will make the loans, but they will make the loans in the form of entering upon their books checking accounts, against which the Government will draw. We will have, not the issuance of paper money, but the creation of checkbook money. This will be legalized and legitimized by being recognized as debt rather than an issuance of paper money and will have interest paid upon it. But, like the issuance of paper money, it will be the creation of additional monetary purchasing power, an increase in purchasing power much greater than the increase in the quantity of goods which may be purchased, and upon which the increased purchasing power will be expended. When we increase the quantity of money and credit, opposite the goods, more rapidly than we increase the quantity of goods for which the money is offered, the result is an increase in the price level, and we have what is described as inflation.

WE NEED DAMS TO HOLD BACK THE FLOOD OF INFLATION

Mr. President, we have seen the flood of waters which has descended upon the helpless towns and cities in Kansas and Missouri, but it is more difficult to visualize the flood of inflation which is suspended over the Nation, and which we are feeding here on the floors of Congress when we pass bills making great appropriations.

The rains of appropriations are beginning to descend. The capacity of the ground to soak up the water is limited, and pretty soon the waters of inflation, unless we do something to stop them, will burst upon the Nation, and we shall have, not a 5-percent, but a 10- or 15- or 20-percent increase in the price level.

What is the result of such an increase? It decreases the real income of everyone who is on an annuity. It decreases the real income of all those who draw interest on bonds, all those who have fixed incomes; and that applies not merely to widows and orphans, but to churches and institutions. Salaried folk never get their salaries increased in the same ratio as that by which prices rise. They take home, week after week, approximately the same amount of money; but they find that each week their money will buy less and less; and so they will be driven down more and more to a lower standard of life. Colleges and churches will be put in difficult situations, because their fixed incomes will yield less and less.

The value of insurance policies will diminish. People who have saved the hard way and accumulated what they thought was a protection against death will find the value of their savings cut away. What is likely to happen is that the great middle class of America, or at least the nonspeculative portion of the middle class of America, will be wiped out, and America will become more and more divided between rich speculators, at the top, and impoverished groups at the bottom. Moreover, industrial strife will increase because it will be hard to keep wages in pace with the increase in the cost of living, and strikes will result.

INFLATION WOULD ENDANGER OUR FREEDOMS

Mr. President, if that day were ever to come to the United States, the political stability of the Nation would be threatened, and we would be in for very bad times, indeed. So I hope that we can take into our thoughts, not merely floods of water, but prospective floods of inflation—I repeat, prospective floods of inflation—and that we will try to build dams here on the floor of the Senate to check the rushing waters of Government expenditure, which are threatening to destroy and carry away the very fabric of the Nation.

Mr. President, that is a hard job. Whenever we approach an individual appropriation bill, and a reduction is proposed, it is immediately replied that the item in question is small in comparison with the total amount to be expended. Recently, on the floor of the Senate, a motion was made to save \$130,000,000. An objection was made that this item, after all, was only about one-seventh of 1 percent of the total amount which

the Government was going to appropriate, and, therefore, why should we consider so small an item as that?

I know that in the pending bill the \$120,000,000 added by the committee may seem to be small in comparison with the \$80,000,000,000 which we are being asked to appropriate, but it is a small tributary stream, so to speak, of the great flood of inflation and of appropriations which faces us. But we can build retaining dams on the small streams as well as on the mighty rivers; and we have one of our chances here and now. If we do not take up these individual items and try to save on them as we go along, then the flood of appropriations will sweep into the main stream, the Government deficit will swell, the Government will be forced to borrow money from the banks, the banks will create more purchasing power, the price level will rise, and disaster will slowly set in, not only upon the middle class, but upon other elements in our society.

So, Mr. President, I think we would do well to examine this and other bills very carefully. I know it is always an ungracious thing to rise on the floor of the Senate to propose a reduction. In the first place, it seems to be egotistical, for the Senator making the suggestion to set his own judgment and knowledge above that of the devoted committee members, who have worked so long and so faithfully.

Mr. President, I hope that I shall not be regarded as speaking in that mood in any sense. I appreciate the work of the committee and the problem with which it was faced, but I also see the danger overhanging the country, and it seems to me that as Members of the Senate we have a responsibility to consider these items from which we cannot wholly divorce ourselves by confiding them to a committee, no matter how well intentioned it may be.

WE SHOULD CUT THE BUDGET BY AT LEAST \$5,000,000,000

I had hoped we could cut the civilian budget by \$2,000,000,000. At the rate we are going, I do not think we shall be able to achieve that figure. I have made a rough tabulation of the economies which the House and Senate have put into effect. Taking the deepest cuts, where no final agreement has been reached, the total savings to date look to be about a billion dollars. In my judgment, Mr. President, we must save at least \$5,000,000,000 out of the total budget, and we are falling well behind that figure. I have thought that, without reducing military effectiveness, if we could possibly squeeze \$2,000,000,000 out of the military budget and a billion dollars out of the foreign-aid budget, we would be nearer to the goal of a saving of \$5,000,000,000. Even with \$5,000,000,000 of savings—and we are not getting anywhere near that figure—if we are to prevent inflation, we shall have to pass a very rigorous tax bill. I think it was Burke who said, "To tax and to please is not given to mortal man." We may have to raise \$10,000,000,000 of revenue during the coming year if we are to prevent inflation.

WE MUST KEEP THE GENERAL PICTURE BEFORE US

So, Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate consider in the pending bill

not merely specific projects, however much they may appeal to us because they help our home communities or our home States, or however much we may feel impressed with the danger of flood from rushing waters. I hope we may realize the necessity of guarding against the danger of an inflationary flood. At an appropriate time I wish to offer amendments to the first title of the bill, the rivers and harbors title, which will save, if agreed to, approximately \$51,000,000.

Because of the fact that we were not able to get a copy of the bill and of the report until this morning, I have not been able to complete my analysis of the flood-control sections of the bill. The hasty inspection I have given leads me to the conclusion that I certainly shall not oppose the proposals for the new dams in Kansas. In view of what Kansas has gone through, even though another flood may not come for 100 years, I believe we should not ask Kansas to take a chance on that contingency. So I do not have the knife out for the Kansas projects.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Illinois, in his usual graphic way, has made a very interesting presentation. I appreciate the statement he has made in behalf of projects in the State of Kansas. Later on in the session I hope to discuss that section of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

There are included in the bill other projects, such as those on the Columbia River, which are possibly for flood control, but I suppose they are largely for power. It is true that the Columbia River and the St. Lawrence River are probably the two rivers which lend themselves mostly to power development, since they have a steady flow of water and a precipitous fall.

I also know that the Pacific Northwest is an area of great power shortage and that atomic energy work is done there. Nevertheless, in the case of these dams, it might perhaps be well if we should attach a provision that they shall be constructed only if certified by the United States Government for national defense, so that their construction would be dependent upon whether they were necessary in the national defense.

We may be able to find some appropriations among the flood-control items which will permit of economies being made, and I hope we shall.

MONEY FOR FURTHER PLANNING NOT NECESSARY

There is one further comment I should like to make, and that is with reference to appropriations for planning. The plans drawn by the Corps of Army Engineers, as I understand, are of two kinds. There are plans for projects authorized but for which appropriations have not yet been made, and there are plans for projects which have not yet been authorized. When I last totaled up the figures we had authorized for construction work under the Army engineers approximately \$5,300,000,000 worth of work in the future for which appropriations had not been made. Therefore the Army engineers would seem to have a pretty large backlog upon

which they can work without undertaking any scouting expeditions to dig up still further projects which they can add to the \$5,300,000,000. So I suggest that the planning provisions for items not authorized should be eliminated. From such study as I have been able to give to the bill, we would by this save approximately \$3,000,000.

PROJECTS CAN OFTEN BE DEFERRED

It has been said by the committee in its very able report that we cannot discontinue projects already started, or slow them up, because the contractor will have a claim against the Government. I have made some inquiry into that matter, and it is my understanding, subject to correction, that the General Accounting Office has held that no agency of the Government can make a binding contract for work for which appropriation has not been made, and that any agency which does make such a binding contract is acting ultra vires.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct with respect to the ultra vires character of the contract in behalf of the Government for the expenditure of money beyond that which has been appropriated or which has been authorized. The provision to which the Senator has referred need not be in the contract, however, because it is in the law, and the contract must be let in the light of the law.

However, the Government sustains losses independent of any claim for damages from a contractor in the case of a complete stoppage of a contract. The contractor also sustains losses thereby, but they are not compensable losses. When the contractor can no longer operate he can close his operation and move his facilities away and look for another chance to lose some more money.

The point is that when he does that the Government has the obligation of protecting the partially finished work. That in itself is no small chore, and represents a considerable sum of money. The Government has frequently purchased equipment on its own account. The equipment oftentimes is on the ground. Again the Government is responsible for protecting the idle material and equipment to which it holds title.

Then the other loss that the Government sustains—and I think it must necessarily flow from the situation—is that once the contractors are aware of the fact that a normal schedule of work on a given project is not to be followed, when they understand that the law is going to be operative, and that they can no longer hope that an adopted work schedule will be followed, then, of necessity, all bids will reflect those unstable conditions, and the bids will be higher, and they will have to be higher, because a contractor must protect himself against any loss he can foresee.

It is those three factors which represent a real loss when a construction program is slowed down or stopped.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. At

least the difficulty of slowing down the rate of construction is not so great as is sometimes assumed. The losses are indirect rather than direct, and they certainly would not apply in the case where we did not start new projects because there could be no loss there. I should think that some slowing down in the rate of construction in projects on which work was already under way could not really cause great losses to the Government.

Mr. President, these are thoughts I have wished to present for the consideration of the Senate.

I now send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated and, at the proper time, considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "\$213,932,613" and insert in lieu thereof "\$163,632,113."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table and explanations of how the amendment offered by me would affect various projects.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects reduced by Douglas amendment to rivers and harbors appropriation item in H. R. 4386

Project	Reductions—		Amount left
	Below Senate committee	Below budget	
Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama.....	\$4,000,000	\$4,500,000	-----
Jim Woodruff Dam, Fla.....	6,300,000	7,000,000	-----
Intracoastal Waterway, Fla.....	2,150,000	2,350,000	-----
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla.....	1,093,500	1,306,500	\$693,000
Buford Dam, Ga.....	900,000	900,000	-----
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City, Iowa.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	1,000,000
Calcasieu River and Pass, La.....	1,025,000	1,025,000	-----
Gulf Intracoastal waterway (Algiers Cut-off), La.....	4,300,000	4,800,000	100,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La.....	987,000	987,000	-----
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth.....	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,000,000
Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.....	305,000	305,000	-----
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----
Schuylkill River, Pa.....	1,900,000	1,900,000	-----
Cheatham Dam, Tenn.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	-----
Old Hickory lock and dam, Tennessee.....	6,000,000	8,000,000	-----
Houston ship channel, Texas.....	500,000	1,000,000	500,000
Plans.....	1,035,000	1,000,000	-----
Illinois waterway, Illinois.....	300,000	300,000	-----
St. Anthony's Falls, Minn.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	-----
Current expenses.....	9,705,000	9,835,000	60,000,000
Total cut.....	50,300,500	55,008,500	-----

DESCRIPTION OF RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS AFFECTED BY DOUGLAS AMENDMENT

Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama

Budget.....	\$4,500,000
House.....	4,000,000
Senate committee.....	4,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	0
Estimated total cost.....	21,000,000
Appropriated to date.....	3,500,000

It is reported that this project is one of the three locks and dams on the Inland waterway system most needing to be re-

placed. The other two are the Cheatham lock and dam on the Cumberland River and the Keokuk lock and dam on the upper Mississippi River. It is noteworthy that even though these three are said to be of high importance, the Corps of Engineers has not requested funds to replace the Keokuk lock and dam. Therefore, why go ahead on this project? The program contemplates initiating construction by continuing contract on the main structures during the current fiscal year. It would appear that at this time the project could be stopped with but small loss, although possibly a contract would need to be terminated. If the project is deferred, the estimate for 1952 can be reduced by the \$4,500,000 requested and probably some funds already allocated be saved.

This project, estimated to cost slightly less than \$21,000,000, was authorized in 1945. To date a little less than \$3,500,000 has been made available. The program for the current year, fiscal 1951, includes completion of plans and specifications, acquisition of land, completion of overburden excavation, completion of access-road construction, and completion of water-supply construction, each of which involves relatively small amounts of money. It is proposed to use \$1,750,000 this year to initiate the continuing contract for construction of the lock, dam, and appurtenances, estimated to cost \$15,750,000. The 1952 budget includes \$4,500,000 for continuing this same feature. The purpose of the construction is to replace four existing locks, called obsolete, with a single new higher-lift lock and dam. The proposed work will be a time saver but apparently will not actually increase the navigability of the waterway.

In short, this project would merely allow longer barge trains to move over an already existing waterway. It can easily be postponed.

Jim Woodruff Dam, Fla.

Budget	\$7,000,000
House	6,300,000
Senate committee	6,300,000
Douglas amendment	0
Estimated total cost	42,000,000
Appropriated to date	15,000,000

Scheduled date of completion of first power unit, December 1953, only 10,000 kilowatts. (This is only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the present capacity in Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.)

This is an illustration of a power project that in my judgment can be deferred. The budget calls for spending another \$7,000,000 on the Jim Woodruff Dam in Florida. The House and Senate committees have recommended \$6,300,000 for this item. Florida is not a mountainous country; power won't be available there for another 2½ years. Would it not perhaps be better to use the \$7,000,000 this year for weapons which we need right now? Seven million dollars would pay for two of the huge B-36 bombers, or 46 of the F-80 fighters. It would pay for 58 tanks or 57,000 bazookas or 115,000 rifles. This same amount of money would maintain 1,800 soldiers for a whole year. I think we should carry out these expenditures first, then maybe next year or the year thereafter we could continue the Jim Woodruff project.

Intracoastal waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.,

Budget	\$2,350,000
House	2,150,000
Senate committee	2,150,000
Douglas amendment	0
Cost of present waterway	7,250,000
Proposed additional work	16,750,000
Appropriated to date	500,000
As of February 1951:	
Total spent	14,900
Total obligated	389,900
(Essentially a new start.)	

A channel 8 feet deep by 100 feet wide has been built between the cities of Jacksonville

and Miami, Fla., at a cost of approximately \$7,250,000. It is now proposed that at an additional cost of \$16,750,000 the channel be deepened to 12 feet and widened to 125 feet. Essentially none of the widening had been done prior to the current fiscal year. The sum of \$500,000 is available for fiscal year 1951 and \$2,350,000 is requested for fiscal year 1952, leaving a remainder of \$13,500,000 for subsequent years. The 12-foot channel in the waterway will constitute a continuation of the existing 12-foot intracoastal waterway along the south Atlantic coast. The agency states that the completion of the authorized project is essential to the economy of the entire eastern seaboard. The agency also points out that large benefits will accrue through the connection of the intracoastal waterway with the Canaveral Harbor Barge Canal, which is contemplated for 1953. It is to be noted that this latter barge canal will have an 8-foot depth and, notwithstanding any interest the Air Force may have in its use, a 12-foot channel in the main intracoastal waterway will not have any beneficial effect upon uses of the 8-foot channel. Traffic over the waterway decreased from a high in 1939 to a low in 1946. Traffic in 1948, the last year of published record, was about midway between the two; 436,000 tons. Cargo carried over the waterway consists largely of petroleum products and these constituted over half the traffic in 1948. The remainder moved over the waterway that year included 170,000 tons of seashells and as next in quantity some 16,000 tons of sand and gravel. Of the 35,000 motor vessels using the waterway, approximately 32,000 drew 4 feet or less; of the 2,200 barges, less than 10 percent drew over 6 feet.

The justifications for this project reads: "Considerable interest has been expressed by the Department of the Air Force relative to the completion of the inland waterway between the St. Johns River and Cocoa as a national defense measure to permit the movement of material and supplies by water to the Air Force proving ground at Cape Canaveral." Such materials could move over the existing 8-foot channel. In the absence of a real defense need it would appear that the project could readily be deferred with a reduction in appropriation of \$2,350,000.

This waterway would be convenient for moving vacationers' yachts and motor launches down to Miami.

Jacksonville Harbor, Fla.

Budget	\$2,000,000
House	693,500
Senate committee	1,787,000
Douglas amendment	693,000

House reduction of \$1,306,500 would leave funds for work in progress, including construction of a cut-off through three sharp and abrupt bends.

However, the House cut would postpone initiation of new work (entrance channel and ship channel dredging). This work can easily be postponed and the House figure should be adhered to.

The new improvement, apparently, is considered necessary to eliminate delays and difficulties of navigation. While Jacksonville harbor is an important terminus, the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for 1949 shows that of the 385 inbound steamers only 6 had drafts of over 30 feet, and only 76 vessels drew over 28 feet. Of the latter group all were steamers except two motor vessels.

Buford Dam, Ga.

Budget	\$900,000
House	0
Senate committee	900,000
Douglas amendment	0
Total cost	40,225,000
Total appropriated to date	2,300,000
As of February 1951:	
Total obligated	1,610,900
Total spent	1,221,000

Essentially a new start can be stopped.

Power not available until December 1955 (40,000 kilowatts) can be postponed as House has done.

This structure, one of four authorized in 1946 for construction as part of the improvement of the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint River system is estimated to cost \$40,225,000. Of the \$1,400,000 provided prior to 1951, approximately \$1,000,000 has been used on nonconstruction items. Construction of saddle dike No. 3 and excavation for the spillway will be completed with funds provided prior to 1951. The bulk of the \$900,000 available in 1951 and most of the \$900,000 requested for 1952 is earmarked for excavation work. Over \$37,000,000 is to be appropriated after fiscal year 1952. The present work schedule is based on placing power on the line in December 1955. The justification states the excavation must be completed before actual dam construction can be started. In addition to power from an initial installation of 40,000 kilowatts, the project is expected to provide water supply for a 9-foot navigation project, water supply for municipal and industrial purposes, flood control, and recreational benefits.

Illinois waterway, Illinois

Budget	\$300,000
House	0
Senate committee	300,000
Douglas amendment	0

Funds requested for 1952 total \$300,000 for additional dredging in the Starved Rock to Lockport reach. The work could probably be deferred, although the amount is not great and safety on this waterway may be relatively important.

Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa

Budget	\$4,000,000
House	4,000,000
Senate committee	4,000,000
Douglas amendment	1,000,000
Total estimated cost	172,000,000
Available so far	100,000,000

The funds are wanted primarily for dike and revetment construction. The agency justifies the request in part on the basis of having lost ground in the project through cessation of new work during World War II. Elsewhere in the estimates the sum of \$4,670,000 is requested for maintenance of the same project. It would appear that the work could again be shut down and maintenance funds should be adequate to prevent serious loss.

This is not flood control, the item for which comes under flood control. It is navigation.

Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana

Budget	\$1,025,000
House	775,000
Senate committee	1,025,000
Douglas amendment	0

A thirty-foot channel is available in this waterway although a 35-foot channel is authorized and is under construction. The funds requested would permit completion of the 35-foot channel in fiscal year 1952. Principal traffic is petroleum products. This channel has been developed since 1937 as an alternate to the Lake Charles deep-water channel which has deteriorated to a depth of approximately 20 feet. The portion of the channel already dredged to 35 feet, the full project depth, cannot be utilized unless the project is completed. However, the small number of ships using such depth does not indicate that the increase is urgently needed.

Gulf intracoastal waterway (Algiers cut-off), Louisiana

Budget	\$4,900,000
House	3,900,000
Senate committee	4,400,000
Douglas amendment	100,000

Of the \$4,900,000 requested, only \$100,000 is for continuation of work underway in 1951. The remainder is for new items of the project, all of which are reported to be necessary before the cut-off can be opened to traffic. Apparently \$4,800,000 of the amount requested could be deferred without physical damage to the work already in place. Justification for its being prosecuted at the present time is not clearly set forth in the presentation.

By stopping new work, this project can be reduced to \$100,000.

Pearl River, Miss. and La.

Budget.....	\$987,000
House.....	987,000
Senate committee.....	987,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

On the basis of the presentation it would appear that the full amount requested, \$987,000, could be deferred without physical damage to the work in place. It is stated that full benefits cannot be expected until the work is completed. It is not, however, clearly set forth that no benefits would materialize from the work already in place.

St. Anthony's Falls, Minneapolis, Minn.

Budget.....	\$1,500,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	1,500,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

This project consists of extending a channel upstream from the present head of navigation a distance of 4.6 miles. While the project will be only 18-percent complete at the end of fiscal year 1951, it is not clear from the presentation whether or not the work can be stopped without damage at this time or how many more years it will take to complete the work estimated to require \$15,000,000 after fiscal year 1952. The presentation does not make it clear that there is any real defense value or necessity of the project. It could be assumed, therefore, that the amount requested could be deferred.

My estimate of this situation has been backed up by the House.

Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth

Budget.....	\$2,300,000
House.....	2,300,000
Senate committee.....	2,300,000
Douglas amendment.....	1,000,000

This project is similar to Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City, except as to the amount of funds requested and the location. This request is for \$2,300,000 and elsewhere in these estimates the amount of \$2,852,000 is requested for maintenance. It would appear that this new work, similar to that proposed for the upper Missouri could be deferred.

Appropriation recommended includes under "Current expenses" \$4,670,000 and \$2,852,000 for these two projects for maintenance. It would appear that much of the new work, at least, could be deferred. New work and maintenance are essentially of same type—jetties, revetment, and dredging. This is navigation not flood control.

Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.

Budget.....	\$305,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	305,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

The funds requested, \$305,000, would provide for deepening the harbor. The project is requested on the basis of safety and ease of navigation. Since it provides only an alternate entrance to the harbor it can be deferred.

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio

Budget.....	\$1,000,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	1,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

Funds requested of \$1,000,000 consist of \$75,000 for improvement of channels and \$925,000 for replacement of a bridge. It is not clear why replacement of the bridge is essential at this time. Therefore, judgement of House of Representatives should be followed.

Schuylkill River, Pa.

Budget.....	\$1,900,000
House.....	1,000,000
Senate committee.....	1,900,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

This project authorized in 1946 is estimated to cost slightly more than 12½ million. Through 1950, \$400,000 was made available primarily for the preparation of disposal areas. No funds were made available for fiscal year 1951. The 1952 program of \$1,900,000 contemplates further work on disposal areas, the initiation of dredging of one pool and the initiation and completion of dredging of a second of the three pools into which the river is divided for the purposes of the project. The project is to remove from the river the great masses of culm, which have gathered through the years as waste products from the coal mines. A justification for Federal participation is that ultimately the culm will move into Philadelphia Harbor and be removed by the Federal Government as maintenance at a greater cost than it can be removed by action where the waste now lays. Since no work on culm removal has started the project can be considered a new project.

Cheatham Dam, Tenn.

Budget.....	\$3,000,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	3,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	0
Total cost.....	14,000,000
Appropriated to date.....	4,000,000

This project on the Cumberland River is considered necessary to relieve a bottleneck in navigation. While over \$10,000,000 of the \$14,000,000 total cost is yet to be appropriated, it is not clear from the justifications the extent to which the additional \$3,000,000 must be made available at this time.

This project is similar to the Demopolis lock and dam project. There is no reason for allowing it to progress while doing nothing about the Keokuk project which is claimed to be equally important.

The House knocked it out and we should stand by this decision.

Old Hickory lock and dam, Tennessee

Budget.....	\$8,000,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	6,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

This project, estimated to cost \$49,120,000, has not yet been started. The sum of \$8,000,000 is requested to initiate construction. This dam would be on the Cumberland River, and provide both power and navigation improvement. The first unit of power, 25,000 kilowatts, would be placed on the line in December 1953. The fourth unit in the same amount would be ready in September 1954 under the schedule presented. This is one of the seven new power projects proposed by the budget.

The House report (p. 3) states:

"The amount of \$8,000,000 requested for beginning construction on the Old Hickory lock and dam, Tenn., is denied. The data submitted to the Congress in justification of this project failed to show that (1) navigation benefits, without construction of other dams, are significant, (2) power needs are urgent, or (3) the project has been adequately planned for construction."

Houston ship channel, Texas

Budget.....	\$1,500,000
House.....	500,000
Senate committee.....	1,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	500,000

The funds requested, \$1,500,000, would provide for completing one reach of channel being started with funds available during the current year and for the initiation and completion of a second reach. The reach to be completed extends to an ordnance depot slip.

The immediate need of deepening the existing channel to 36 feet in the reach to be started and completed in fiscal year 1952 is not obvious from the presentation. It may be that this item could be eliminated for the time being without serious inconvenience or loss. On the other hand, in view of the great industrial growth of the whole Houston area the project may be worthy of continuation at this time as a part of the preparedness program. Since the last annual report for 1949 shows only two out-bound steamers as having drafts of 34 feet and only one in-bound vessel with a draft as much as 32 feet, it would appear that doubt might be resolved in favor of deferral.

Preparation of plans

Budget.....	\$1,000,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	1,035,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

The Department requests \$1,000,000 for further preparation of plans on nine projects which are estimated to cost a total of over \$1,300,000,000. The amount requested can be eliminated without disrupting any construction, since the projects involved have not yet been started. On the other hand, it would seem sound that some planning go forward at this time so that projects found to be worth while can be undertaken in the future at such time as deemed proper without conflict with the defense program.

Current expense

Budget.....	\$69,835,000
House.....	65,000,000
Senate committee.....	69,705,000
Douglas amendment.....	60,000,000

The budget includes a request totaling \$69,835,000 for funds in the category of current expenses. This includes \$62,670,000 for routine operation and maintenance, \$800,000 for removing sunken vessels and straightening channels, \$1,650,000 for surveys and studies, \$1,685,000 for miscellaneous inspections, investigations, and enforcement of regulations, \$1,170,000 for salaries in Washington, and \$1,860,000 for transfers to other agencies of the Federal Government for work on behalf of the Corps of Engineers program. On the basis of past experience it can be expected that the amount requested would provide ample operations. However, the presentation gives no basis for any deviation from the amount requested. It would appear that any reduction made would have to be based on a rule of thumb percentage reduction, recognizing that some maintenance might then need to be deferred and some of the less worthy projects carried forward in a less completely maintained status.

Uneconomic projects can be abandoned. This was done in the case of the Hennepin Canal in Illinois, and it can be done in other places.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for the splendid way in which he has presented a problem that concerns all of us. I trust that as we continue the present debate we will hear statements of those having varying views on the present situation and the problems resulting from it.

At this time I again wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and members of

the committee, for the courtesies they extended citizens of the flood areas of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma by granting them a generous amount of time to present their problems to the committee.

Second, I wish to commend the Civil Functions Subcommittee and the members of the full Appropriations Committee for heeding the pleas of our citizens and recommending appropriations to the Senate for the commencement of some of the projects under the Pick-Sloan plan.

Third, I wish to commend Gen. Lewis A. Pick and his staff in Washington and the division and district offices in Omaha and Kansas City, first for the personal interest they have taken in the disastrous floods in the devastated area. This was mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee, who stated that General Pick did not send someone into the area to study the floods, but went there himself. Second, I wish to commend them for the prompt way in which they presented a request for supplemental appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget.

We are fortunate, in my opinion, to have General Pick as the Chief of Engineers at this time. He is thoroughly familiar with the problems of the Missouri River Basin. He is coauthor of the Pick-Sloan plan.

Fourth, I wish to commend Michael Straus, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the members of his staff for the prompt manner in which they sent their representative into the tributary watersheds to evaluate the damage caused by the recent floods. It is my hope that they will soon have recommendations to present to Congress on proposed reclamation projects in these flooded areas. These recommendations will be based upon information secured as the result of the greater volumes of water that have flowed through these tributary streams in the recent floods.

Recently, I wrote Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of Interior, and urged that he make a request to the Bureau of the Budget for supplemental appropriations to commence some of the reservoir projects on the Solomon and Saline Rivers.

The most destructive floods in the history of the United States occurred during the months of June and July of this year. It is estimated that the total flood damage in the States of Kansas and Oklahoma is in excess of \$1,000,000,000.

The devastation and destruction done by these floods, through the loss of life and the loss of property, stands as a monument to our failure to provide flood control on these streams.

During my service in the House of Representatives in 1938, at which time I was a member of the House Flood Control Committee, we prepared, and Congress adopted, a general, comprehensive plan for flood control and for other purposes in the Missouri River Basin. This recommendation on the part of our committee was approved by Congress on June 28, 1938.

Fortunately we do have a comprehensive plan for flood control, soil conservation, power, recreation, and storage of water for beneficial uses. It is the Pick-Sloan plan.

Mr. President, I was pleased that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] discussed this all-inclusive program. It is a comprehensive program, and I am not one of those who believe that one phase of the work is all we need to complete in order to control the floods on the major streams and the tributary streams.

Unfortunately, many of the opponents of the Pick-Sloan plan call it a big-dam plan. The truth is that it is an all-inclusive program, and if carried out in full as approved by Congress, it would control water runoff at its source through terracing, soil-conservation practices, and detention dams on the tributary streams. In addition, it provides for large reservoirs for impounding a large volume of water.

The agricultural phase of the Pick-Sloan plan was submitted to Congress in House Document 373, Eighty-first Congress, second session, and is now in the Committee on Agriculture.

During the hearings before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I appeared personally and urged the inclusion of funds for the control of tributary watersheds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations be made a part of the record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARLSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity of appearing before your committee and urging sufficient appropriations for a program of soil conservation and the source control of water runoff.

During my service in the House of Representatives, I had the opportunity of helping write legislation for a coordinated program of river-basin development with multiple-purpose objectives.

This program especially emphasized the conservation of the productive-land resources of a basin, and in addition to checking erosion, dealt with the problem of control of water runoff at its source.

It is my contention that there is a great urgency that we intensify action on this program of erosion control and conservation work on the basis of distinct watersheds. I stress this program and development for the reasons that—

1. It is important that we intensify our efforts to save topsoil;
 2. Every effort should be made to control the flow of water at its source;
 3. This program would have a direct bearing on the amount of floodwaters that cause devastation in the valleys; and
 4. It would reduce the rate of siltation in reservoirs that are already constructed, or being considered in the Missouri River Basin.
- Kansas and many States in the Midwest have suffered seriously from floods this year. In many instances there have been flash floods on small tributary watersheds which proved as disastrous to the very headwaters of small streams as to our large rivers.

The Soil Conservation Service has a number of demonstration projects which deal with entire watersheds. These projects have demonstrated their value by protecting the land with terraces, erosion control, dams, and other conservation measures which came through the storms with comparatively light damage.

It is my contention that these types of programs should have the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers for a coordinated flood-control program for the entire watersheds.

I realize that this job presents a program of water conservation and flood control that requires special authorization for the Department of Agriculture. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will have an opportunity to authorize the recommendations as printed in House Document No. 373, Eighty-first Congress, first session, and now in the Committee on Agriculture.

It is also my hope that a coordinated soil control and water runoff program may be carried on through the regular Soil Conservation Service on a watershed basis.

I would urge this committee to authorize sufficient funds that we might have at least two projects started in the State of Kansas on a complete watershed basis.

These projects would serve as pilot projects for demonstration purposes.

There is much interest in this program in our State, and therefore, I urge that the committee give serious consideration to this request.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this comprehensive plan for flood control, water runoff, and soil erosion was developed after years of study. Thousands of dollars were spent and volumes of data were gathered. The best engineering talent of the world was consulted and they put in concrete form the proposal which would place in operation structures which would forever remove the fear of flood. These plans are specific for each river basin.

As I stated previously, a comprehensive and all-inclusive program has developed or is developing basic plans for the reduction of water runoff and erosion control through the Soil Conservation Service. These plans are a concurrent work, vitally necessary in order to protect tributary watersheds, reduce land loss, preserve our soils, and prevent silting of reservoirs.

There is no difference of opinion between the various governmental agencies on the effectiveness of this coordinated program. With reservoirs and the soil-conservation program floods can be stopped.

Mr. President, one of the difficulties and one of the serious problems in constructing a reservoir is the hardships resulting from the dislocations of the owners of the property in the reservoir area.

It is regrettable that a large number of farmers and citizens will be required to give up their land and homes in the reservoir area. A dam and reservoir must naturally be located in the fertile valleys of our State where we have some of our richest and best soils.

Many of these farms have been in the family for decades and sometimes for generations. Under these circumstances, it means more than just farm lands and buildings—it means that a home has been established which has been an important part of the economic

and community life of that section and of the State.

Generally speaking, these farms in the river valleys which will be flooded comprise farm units which have as a part of their balanced agricultural operation grass lands, which fit into the over-all farm picture. When the bottom land is removed from the farm unit which has furnished the feed and forage for livestock grazed on the grass lands, the value of the farm is destroyed. More than that, in most instances there is great sentiment attached to these homes. It is the social unit that established and maintained the church, the school, and the home which is so vital in the life of any community or nation.

I can state very definitely that the dislocation of the homes and the destruction of these farms distress me greatly. We regret the loss of the production of these farms. But everyone must agree we cannot permit a recurrence of the past floods if it can be prevented.

We must view the project, its benefits and effect on the entire economic picture of the State on a long-time basis.

I have discussed the matter of land acquisition for proposed reservoirs in Kansas with the Chief Engineers' office. The Corps of Army Engineers has a real-estate division within its own organization for the acquisition of lands needed for dam sites, rights-of-way and easements. The personnel of the real-estate division in the various division offices has had much experience in dealing with this problem and has been advised by the authorities in charge to keep in mind not only the actual loss sustained by these people, but also the problem that will be confronting them in securing a new location.

I am urging that more consideration be given the farmers who are to be displaced in the reservoir area. For instance, if there is a railroad, a highway, a city, a cemetery or a public utility within the boundaries of the proposed dam site and reservoir, the government will reestablish the facility in as good or better condition than it was in the old site. It seems to me that the farmer should be entitled to the same consideration.

I am going to make one suggestion. I do not know how practical it will be, but it seems to me to be worthy of consideration. I suggest that when funds have been voted for the commencement of a reservoir and work is actually under way, the Government pay the farmers for their land at the earliest possible date, and that the farmer be given an opportunity to live on his place and receive the benefits from it until the construction is complete.

Under existing law, great acreages of the flood area in a reservoir are leased annually by the Corps of Army Engineers. The farmer who owned the farm previous to the Government's taking it over is given the first opportunity to lease this land if he so desires.

It seems to me that it is only reasonable to insist that the Government deal fairly and most generously with these citizens. Not only that, I believe that the Government should, so far as possible, relocate the farmer on a site approxi-

mately equal to that which he is giving up.

If some such provision could be written into law or carried out by existing authorities, it would do much to alleviate one of the difficult problems in constructing a reservoir.

Great economic benefits can and will come to the basin on the completion of this program.

During the past few weeks I have received some letters urging me to oppose the expenditures of moneys for flood control. Now everyone realizes that in a period of national emergency when there is great need for national defense money, we must economize; but I would be untrue to my trust if I voted to economize on our own citizens and yet the Congress voted millions of dollars for flood-control and reclamation programs in many foreign countries.

Let us keep the record straight. I am for taking care of our own citizens first. Had we spent \$300,000,000 in the State of Kansas for flood control, we would not have had the \$1,000,000,000 loss. That expenditure to me would not only be sound, but would be a prudent investment for the future.

I think I should mention that during the past few years Congress has voted money for the exact duplicate type of flood-control programs for reservoirs and reclamation projects in foreign countries. Many of these are on a much larger scale than proposed for our State.

The records show that we have been spending hundreds of millions of dollars for this type of program in French Indochina, Thailand, Italy, France, Greece, French Morocco, Dutch Guiana, British Guiana, and Jamaica. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Tennessee mentioned the fact that we are about to carry on a great survey and study in Burma.

If we are to continue to assist our foreign friends and neighbors, we must make provision to protect and preserve our own economy. We cannot afford the continued loss and destruction of our soil, our homes, and our factories.

During this debate no doubt someone is going to come up with the old familiar slogan "A Vote for Flood Control Is a Pork Barrel Vote."

During my service in the House of Representatives the words "pork barrel" were the rallying cry for those who would oppose these expenditures. The answer, of course, is that we have constructed a large number of flood-control projects in the United States and they have been and are paying big dividends.

I invite those who are going to shout about "pork barrel" expenditures to visit the devastated flood areas in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. They should see the desolate empty spaces where once stood the homes of thousands of our citizens with all their worldly possessions. They should see the destruction that was wrought to the railroads, the highways, and the utilities in that area. They should see the destruction that was wrought in the great industrial centers of those cities.

So far as I am concerned, the odium that might be attached to the words

"pork barrel" is not going to deter me from working for and voting for a program that will protect our citizens from another disastrous flood.

Our first problem, of course, is to take care of the needy and those who lost their all in the flood. They must be rehabilitated, the farms must be returned to normal production, the factories must be reopened.

Our second problem is to reconstruct and rebuild the levees that were damaged and destroyed and then construct reservoirs that will impound a large volume of this water.

Had these reservoirs been constructed in the recent flood the crest would have been several feet lower and the damage materially reduced.

With one-third of the money lost in this flood, the river basins in Kansas would have had protection for decades to come.

Mr. President, on July 21, following the disastrous flood in Kansas, Senator Arthur Capper, a former colleague and Member of this body for many years, wrote a fine editorial known as Farmer Support for Basic Pick-Sloan Plan.

I can state very definitely and very honestly that no one in Kansas has been more devoted to the interests of the people of our State than our former distinguished Senator Arthur Capper. In this editorial he not only discusses the great damage done to our citizens in the Kansas River Valley but over the entire State and states that it is with reluctance that he endorses and approves a program that will dislocate many farm families.

I want to assure you, Mr. President, that I share his views on this very difficult problem.

In reaching his conclusion to endorse the Pick-Sloan plan and urging appropriations for the early commencement of projects as proposed in that plan, he states:

I will hold firmly to the opinion that in the long run the true interest of the land and the people on the land, and in the cities, will be best served by impounding surplus waters nearest the points where the rain falls.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPPER ASKS FARMER SUPPORT FOR BASIC PICK-SLOAN PLAN

As I see it, the difference between a 32-foot flood stage on the Kaw at Topeka, and a 37-foot stage, is the difference between dikes for protection on the one hand; and on the other hand, dams and reservoirs such as Tuttle Creek on the Blue, Milford on the Republican, and other dams and reservoirs to hold back the disastrous floodwaters until the danger stage has passed.

I am using the Kaw Valley simply as an example. The same holds true for other river valleys in Kansas that have overflowed, causing perhaps close to a billion dollars damage to industry and agriculture and householders in the past few weeks.

FOR PICK-SLOAN PLAN

Faced with the probable alternative of a Missouri Valley Authority, my advice to the farmers of Kansas today is to go along with the basic provisions of the Pick-Sloan plan. It is highly preferable, in my judgment, to that alternative, the creation of a Missouri

Valley Authority that would give Washington life and death powers over agriculture, business, industry, and labor in the entire area.

I have come to this decision with reluctance. The idea of putting 500 farmers off their land in the fertile valley of the Blue River above Manhattan is most repugnant to me. The loss of production of these fertile acres also is most regrettable. But the devastation wrought by the recent floods cannot be permitted to happen again, if humanly possible to prevent.

VIEW ON DAMS

If I could have my way, these big dams and reservoirs would be constructed for flood control, but not coupled up with grandiose schemes for recreation, navigation, irrigation, and federally controlled electric power projects.

But the plans that have been drawn in the past few years all seem to call for multiple-purpose reservoirs. Federal funds can be obtained only for multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs. Without Federal funds, it is extremely doubtful if adequate flood control projects will be constructed.

I will hold firmly to the opinion that in the long run the true interest of the land and the people on the land, and in the cities,

will be best served by impounding surplus waters nearest the points where the rain falls.

CONSERVATION STILL NEEDED

Approved land and water conservation practices, contour farming and terracing; farm ponds and numerous reservoirs of smaller type than the mammoth Tuttle Creeks and Milfords and such, still will be necessary. These will be necessary not only to conserve the soil for production purposes, but also to stave off as long as possible the accumulation of silt in the large-type reservoirs.

My heart goes out in sympathy to those whose homes have been devastated by these catastrophic floods of 1951. The task of restoring these homes to make them livable; the slime, the mud, the stench; the back-breaking, discouraging work of getting the job done in the distressful humid heat of July and August in these river valley homes, towns, and cities—these try the souls of men and women almost beyond endurance, it will seem.

PEOPLE WILL MEET TEST

But I know the people of Kansas, on the farms, in the towns, in the cities, in the homes. In my 86 years I have known them, their fathers and mothers, their grandfathers and grandmothers. Through three gen-

erations I have watched them meet and conquer adversity with high courage and dogged determination.

The motto of the State of Kansas, "To the stars through difficulties," has been tested and proved through the better part of the century since white men first came to settle in the Flint Hills and on the prairies.

We will take this 1951 flood and its ravages in our stride, and do the things necessary to prevent the wholesale devastation and suffering happening again. Another like it may not come again in a half century—but there is no assurance that it might not come again next year, or any year thereafter.

So we must prepare for the worst—and prepare also to make the best of it, whatever happens.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Corps of Army Engineers has submitted a list of the authorized and unauthorized proposed reservoir projects on the Kansas River watersheds, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS RIVER BASIN

Project	Stream	Storage (acre-feet)				Estimated cost	Appropriate to date
		Flood control	Irrigation	Conservation	Total		
AUTHORIZED							
Corps of Engineers:							
Harlan County Reservoir.....	Republican.....	500,000	150,000	200,000	850,000	\$49,897,000	\$46,132,400
Red Willow Reservoir.....	Red, Willow Creek.....	22,000	15,500	11,000	48,500	10,017,000	0
Pioneer Reservoir.....	Arikaree.....	73,000	10,000	26,000	109,000	15,700,000	181,000
Kanopolis Reservoir.....	Smoky Hill.....	213,000	187,000	50,000	450,000	12,167,000	12,167,000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir.....	Big Blue.....	1,600,000	495,000	185,000	2,280,000	71,573,000	213,100
Bureau of Reclamation:							
Cedar Bluff Reservoir.....	Smoky Hill.....	230,000	68,600	53,600	352,200	20,311,000	15,500,000
Kirwin Reservoir.....	North Fork, Solomon.....	105,000	80,000	15,000	200,000	18,155,000	455,000
Trenton Reservoir.....	Republican.....	95,000	45,000	30,000	170,000	24,165,000	19,887,500
Medicine Creek Reservoir.....	Medicine Creek.....	53,000	25,000	15,000	93,000	7,157,000	7,000,000
Norton (Almena) Reservoir.....	Prairie Dog Creek.....		10,000	6,000	16,000	11,100,000	0
Enders Reservoir.....	Frenchman Creek.....	30,000	34,000	10,000	74,000	8,409,000	8,000,000
Wray Reservoir, Colo.....	North Fork, Arikaree.....		7,500	500	8,000	2,410,000	47,200
Bonny Reservoir, Colo.....	Republican.....	132,000	35,000	15,000	182,000	15,156,000	13,839,000
Glen Elder Reservoir.....	Solomon.....	183,000	171,100	25,000	379,100	24,273,000	0
Webster Reservoir.....	South Fork, Solomon.....	94,000	150,000	11,000	255,000	14,881,000	0
Wilson Reservoir.....	Saline River.....	145,000	224,900	19,000	388,900	14,869,000	0
RECOMMENDED							
(H. Doc. 642, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)							
Corps of Engineers:							
Milford Reservoir.....	Republican.....	700,000		40,000	740,000	26,143,000	0
Perry Reservoir.....	Delaware River.....	187,000	147,000	26,000	360,000	11,697,000	0

VERDIGRIS RIVER BASIN

AUTHORIZED							
Corps of Engineers:							
Fall River Reservoir.....	Fall River.....	236,000	-----	27,000	263,000	\$10,722,500	\$10,722,500
Toronto Reservoir.....	Verdigris River.....	171,000	-----	24,000	195,000	15,000,000	260,000
Elk City Reservoir.....	Elk River.....	263,000	-----	26,000	289,000	21,030,000	115,000
Neodesha Reservoir.....	Verdigris River.....	80,000	-----	10,000	90,000	14,330,000	125,000

GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN

AUTHORIZED							
Corps of Engineers:							
Council Grove Reservoir.....	Neosho River.....	60,000	-----	25,000	85,000	8,240,000	0
Marion Reservoir.....	Cottonwood River.....	60,000	-----	30,000	90,000	6,650,000	0
Cedar Point Reservoir.....	Cedar Creek.....	36,200	-----	18,800	55,000	5,285,000	0
Strawn Reservoir.....	Neosho River.....	322,000	-----	52,000	374,000	18,445,000	0

OSAGE RIVER BASIN

RECOMMENDED							
(H. Doc. 549, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)							
Corps of Engineers:							
Pomona Reservoir.....	110 Mile Creek.....	155,000	-----	26,000	181,000	\$9,076,000	0
Melvern Reservoir.....	Marais des Cygnes River.....	170,000	-----	28,000	198,000	13,000,000	0
Garnett Reservoir.....	Pottawatomie Creek.....	160,000	-----	26,000	186,000	9,865,000	0
Hillsdale Reservoir.....	Big Bull Creek.....	77,000	-----	13,000	90,000	5,924,000	0
Fort Scott Reservoir.....	Marmaton River.....	130,750	-----	6,250	137,000	10,674,000	0

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the American National Red Cross furnished me statistics on the estimated property damage and Red Cross caseload as of July 25, 1951. These figures were secured from counties that suffered disastrous flood losses.

41,780 families were affected; 1,572 homes were completely destroyed; 5,350

homes suffered major damage; and 13,715 suffered minor damage.

The 1,572 homes were completely destroyed. They were not there any more. It was my privilege to visit some of these areas, and I saw beautiful residential sections completely washed away.

Of course, the statistics do not tell the

story of mental and physical agony that the citizens suffered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American National Red Cross—Statistics on estimated property damage and Red Cross case load. Where no figures appear information is lacking as of July 25, 1951

County and headquarters or chapter	Number of families affected	Number of homes destroyed	Number of homes damaged		Registrations estimated		County and headquarters or chapter	Number of families affected	Number of homes destroyed	Number of homes damaged		Registrations estimated	
			Major	Minor	To date	Total registrations				Major	Minor	To date	Total registrations
Kansas:							Kansas—Continued						
Wyandotte County, Kansas City	12,500	850	650	1,780	6,500	7,000	Morris County, Council Grove	500	2	15	300	66	75
Douglas County, Lawrence	1,100	60	225	220	500	650	Wabunsee County, Paxico	180	10	55	115	49	70
Shawnee County, Topeka	7,600	300	1,500	2,500	2,750	3,200	Leavenworth County, Leavenworth	125	7	30	78	25	35
Franklin County, Ottawa	1,000	45	150	350	430	500	Jefferson County, Perry	361	5	50	300	100	175
Riley County, Manhattan	2,251	79	476	883	410	500	Pottawatomie County, Wamego	250	10	100	140	0	50
Geary County, Junction City	600	50	100	180	203	250	Cloud County, Concordia	100	0	15	80	24	30
Saline County, Salina	5,700	0	115	2,768	537	1,000	Ottawa County, Tescott	750	0	20	650	28	50
LaBette County, Parsons	505	5	200	300	43	105	Mitchell County, Beloit	375	0	50	250	25	50
Neosho County, Chanute	510	20	25	434	180	250	Lincoln County, Bernard	120	0	15	100	11	35
Allen County, Iola	1,215	35	910	167	361	475	Barton County, Great Bend	150	0	0	10	0	0
Woodson County, Yates Center	158	8	82	68	119	140	Johnson County, Olathe	100	27	31	8	64	80
Coffey County, Burlington	285	15	15	254	61	70	Total	41,780	1,572	5,350	13,715	13,282	15,970
Miami County, Paola	1,000	30	200	500	149	200	Oklahoma:						
Lyon County, Emporia	200	0	1	50	21	55	Miami County, Ottawa	1,700	50	350	1,300	413	1,300
Chase County, Cottonwood Falls	700	10	45	90	147	230	Nowata County, Nowata	60	0	20	60	15	15
Marion County, Marion	1,500	5	40	610	380	475							
Dickinson County, Herrington	45	0	0	30	17	20							
Dickinson County, Abilene	1,900	0	100	500	82	200							

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. Emmett Womer, chairman of the State Agriculture Mobilization Committee, has furnished me with statistics showing the flood loss to crops in Kansas in 82 of the State's 105 counties to be \$54,454,000. According to the information he submitted, the total flood damage to crops, buildings, and equipment was \$76,338,477. The survey shows more than 20,000 of the State's 137,000 farms were damaged directly by flooding. More than 2,866,000 acres were inundated, of which 2,268,000 were in crops. Ravines, ditches, or gullies were hollowed out by the floods on some 565,000 acres.

Completely destroyed were 244 farm dwellings and 3,724 more were badly damaged, for a loss of \$5,841,000.

The floods took 455 barns with them and left 3,564 badly damaged for a loss of \$2,308,000. Other farm buildings destroyed totaled 4,296 and an additional 8,603 were badly damaged. The loss here was \$3,495,000.

Total farm machinery lost totaled \$2,527,000. This included the loss of 84 tractors, 176 cars and trucks, and 178 other pieces of farm machinery. Badly damaged were 1,564 tractors, 1,609 cars and trucks, and 2,049 other machines.

Easy prey to floodwaters, farm fencing destroyed totaled 10,000 miles, and badly damaged fencing added another 12,000 miles, for a total cost of three and a half million dollars.

Livestock loss was not so heavy. It totaled \$829,793, which included the loss of 1,500 cattle, 1,033 sheep, 7,962 hogs, and 256,000 poultry.

Flood loans will be sought by more than 4,000 farmers, Mr. Womer said.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the statistics furnished me by Mr. Womer.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE ESTIMATE OF DAMAGE FROM FLOOD, WET WEATHER, WIND, AND HAIL, JULY 25, 1951

Section I. Flood area. (If you have no flood area in your county, fill out report p. 4 only.)

A. Farm and acreage information:

1. Number of farms in this county..... 137,521

2. Number of farms directly damaged by flood..... 20,248

3. What was the approximate acreage damaged by flood?

(a) Cropland, 2,268,415 acres; noncropland, 618,940 acres; total, 2,886,275 acres.

(b) Of the above total how many acres were physically damaged by floodwater (cutting, excessive silt or sand deposits, debris, etc.), 565,819 acres.

B. How many buildings, fences, machines, and equipment were destroyed or badly damaged?

	Destroyed (number)	Badly damaged (number)	Estimated damage in dollars
1. Farm buildings destroyed or badly damaged.			
(a) Dwellings.....	244	3,724	5,841,050
(b) Barns.....	455	3,564	2,308,200
(c) Grain storage buildings and bins.....	964	2,888	1,207,700
(d) Other buildings.....	3,332	5,715	2,287,675
2. Farm machinery:			
(a) Tractors.....	84	1,564	627,600
(b) Cars and trucks.....	176	1,609	786,600
(c) Combines, hay balers, and corn pickers.....	178	2,400	1,002,970
3. Major electrical equipment on farms:			
(a) Farm (including feed grinders, milking machines, large motors, milk coolers, etc.).....	429	2,260	170,744
(b) Home (including refrigerators, stoves, deep freezers, etc.).....	827	3,645	652,765
4. Fences (report in miles).....	10,014	11,995	3,494,965
Total estimated damage (add B1, 2, 3, 4).....			18,380,26

C. How many acres of crops were originally planted, completely lost, or damaged in flooded areas?

	Acres planted	Acres completely lost—		Acres damaged but will probably be harvested	Estimated loss in dollars
		Prior to June 1	After June 1		
Wheat.....	1,007,426	74,716	515,810	308,556	19,705,574
Oats.....	157,275	13,578	77,586	30,310	2,167,319
Corn.....	537,046	8,566	328,622	154,038	16,343,166
Soybeans.....	84,107	140	59,048	17,325	2,681,641
Sorghum.....	165,322	3,282	84,237	36,559	3,789,810
Alfalfa.....		10,995	113,354	55,599	6,391,326
All other crops ¹	173,057	3,174	92,915	28,527	3,375,250
Total value of all crops lost.....					54,454,086

¹ List on back information for such crops as bromegrass seed, sweetclover seed, potatoes, etc.

D. How many livestock and poultry were lost in flooded areas?

	Number	Estimated loss
Cattle less Wyandotte County.....	1,549	\$321,250
Sheep less Wyandotte County.....	1,499	311,250
Hogs less Wyandotte County.....	13,033	49,150
Poultry less Wyandotte County.....	1,033	28,750
	13,962	408,613
	7,962	228,613
	271,000	276,180
	256,000	261,180
Total value of all livestock loss less Wyandotte County.....		1,055,193
		829,793

E. How much stored grain and roughage was lost in flooded areas?

	Amount lost	Estimated loss
Wheat, bushels.....	139,020	\$277,840
Corn, bushels.....	358,280	552,423
Other grains, bushels.....	155,407	246,807
All hay, tons.....	102,481	1,597,259
Total value of stored grain and roughage lost.....		2,674,329

F. Total of estimated loss on farms in flooded areas (add B, C, D, and E), \$76,338,477.

H. How much emergency assistance will be needed in flooded areas?

1. Feed supplies not available locally but will be needed before Sept. 1, 1951:
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| (a) Grains, bushels..... | 209,700 |
| (b) Hay, tons..... | 1,000 |
| (c) Protein concentrates, tons..... | 3,975 |

	Acres planted	Acres completely lost—		Acres damaged but will probably be harvested	Estimated loss in dollars
		Prior to June 1	After June 1		
Wheat.....	12,944,041	2,875,918	1,549,837	5,871,579	107,685,278
Oats.....	1,048,090	91,565	264,583	611,667	10,368,221
Corn.....	2,143,899	6,400	262,228	1,058,333	11,199,544
Soybeans.....	350,315	350	57,603	217,957	3,441,773
Sorghum.....	3,679,083	33,208	822,312	1,305,208	15,857,085
Alfalfa.....		22,600	104,410	382,964	7,314,620
All other crops ¹	576,533	36,200	86,275	262,475	5,358,226
Total value of all crops lost.....					192,405,779

C. How much emergency assistance will be needed on farms not in the flood area?

1. Feed supplies not available locally that will be needed before Sept. 1, 1951:
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| (a) Grains, bushels..... | 208,500 |
| (b) Hay, tons..... | |
| (c) Protein concentrates, tons..... | 2,692 |
2. How many farms will need disaster loans for crop production? Number, 5,008. Estimated amount, \$3,692,200.
3. Other needs.....

2. About how many farmers will need disaster loans? 4,021.

Of this number how many loans will be for:

	Number	Estimated amount
(a) Crop production.....	3,055	\$2,860,700
(b) Livestock and equipment.....	1,381	1,907,000
(c) Buildings and fence repair.....	1,511	2,937,500

3. Other needs: \$545,400.

4. Restoration of established conservation practices:

	Amount	Estimated cost of repairs
(a) Terraces, miles damaged.....	251	14,968
(b) Stock water ponds, number damaged.....	72	10,325
(c) Diversion terraces, number damaged.....	279	21,315
(d) Terrace outlets, acres damaged.....	634	44,695
(e) Erosion control dams, number damaged.....	120	8,625

I. List damage to nonfarm businesses and facilities serving farmers principally such as grain elevators, transportation facilities, seed and fertilizer dealers, and packing plants. (List on separate sheet if necessary.)

Section II. Nonflood area report:

A. Farm information:

1. Number of farms not in flood area..... 115,541
2. Number of such farms damaged by excessive rain, hail, or wind..... 100,965
- B. How many acres of crops on these farms were originally planted, completely lost or damaged by rain, hail, or wind?

	Acres planted	Acres completely lost—		Acres damaged but will probably be harvested	Estimated loss in dollars
		Prior to June 1	After June 1		
Wheat.....	12,944,041	2,875,918	1,549,837	5,871,579	107,685,278
Oats.....	1,048,090	91,565	264,583	611,667	10,368,221
Corn.....	2,143,899	6,400	262,228	1,058,333	11,199,544
Soybeans.....	350,315	350	57,603	217,957	3,441,773
Sorghum.....	3,679,083	33,208	822,312	1,305,208	15,857,085
Alfalfa.....		22,600	104,410	382,964	7,314,620
All other crops ¹	576,533	36,200	86,275	262,475	5,358,226
Total value of all crops lost.....					192,405,779

4. Restoration of established conservation practices:

	Amount	Estimated cost of repairs
(a) Terraces, miles damaged.....	6,335	\$332,940
(b) Stock water ponds, number damaged.....	3,359	291,925
(c) Diversion terraces, number damaged.....	856	37,775
(d) Terrace outlets, acres damaged.....	7,710	176,475
(e) Erosion control dams, number damaged.....	1,303	80,475

¹ List on back information for such crops as bromegrass seed, sweetclover seed, potatoes, etc.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to state that action on the program for flood control as proposed in the Pick-Sloan plan must be immediate.

It is true that not since 1903, 48 years ago, have we had a major flood in the Kaw River Valley. It is also true that we have floods practically every year in some sections of our State and every few years in the Kaw River Basin. Our engineers have given us a program. Congress knows the needs and the problem. Let us vote funds sufficient to get it underway immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial I wrote on July 17, 1951, at the request of Ed Chapman, editor of the Topeka State Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD AND GO TO WORK

Kansas has been called bleeding Kansas—today that blood is the floodwaters spreading overwhelming disaster and carrying with them and lost forever a great wealth washed from our land and from our cities.

Kansas is traversed, blessed and cursed, by great river watersheds—the Kaw, Arkansas, Neosho, Verdigris, and Marais des Cygnes. We have never fully accented the blessings and all too often we receive the curses. Each of these streams is a constant flood hazard, each has frequently left its banks to destroy and lay waste.

Fifteen years ago the Federal Government accepted as a national duty the protection of its citizens from flood. It embarked on a program of construction which has caused many structures, dams, and walls to be built across the country. The Government accepted this burden for several reasons, but two are well worth reviewing. First, flood losses are total losses which take from the Nation wealth that can never be replaced, and disrupt communities frequently in times of national stress such as we are enduring this year. Second, with a rapidly growing population, and hence an increasing need for jobs and production—a program which will reduce preventable economic losses to a minimum is a national must.

Following that program, Kansas early obtained the money to build three small dams. In addition, planning was initiated in each of the flood basins to develop plans for prevention of future floods. These comprehensive plans for flood control, water runoff, and soil erosion were developed after years of study. Thousands of dollars were spent and volumes of data were gathered. The best engineering talent of the world was consulted and used to put in concrete form a proposal which would put in operation, structures that would forever remove the fear of flood. These plans are specific for each basin.

The Kaw will be made tame by means of 3 dams and 10 local protection projects to be built by the Corps of Engineers—several dams by the Bureau of Reclamation will provide waters for beneficial uses besides holding future floods.

The Neosho and Verdigris have similar plans and the Marais des Cygnes will also have its impounding dams.

In addition, a comprehensive and all-inclusive program has or is developing basic plans for the reduction of water runoff and erosion control through the Soil Conservation Service. These plans are a concurrent work, vitally necessary in order to protect

tributary watersheds, reduce land loss, preserve our soils and prevent silting of reservoirs.

There is no difference of opinion between the various governmental agencies on the effectiveness of this coordinated program. With reservoirs and the soil conservation program floods can be stopped.

After a good start, Kansas has lagged in getting its work done. True, the lag in part has been caused by honest democratic debate and delay. But while the debate has been intense—debate has never built a reservoir nor protected our valleys.

It is imperative that we have action and have it now. The floods have not neglected their opportunity and today Kansas is the recipient of sympathy from the Nation. Congress has passed emergency legislation. Foreign governments have expressed their sorrow to our President. These well-meaning gestures will never bring back the lost lives nor the soil nor the homes or factories. Nor will they prevent the same thing happening again.

The time for work is here—in fact we are away late. Let's forget our past arguments, let's get the job done—but fast.

It is my firm conviction, after detailed examination of the basic plans prepared by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, that if we work together among ourselves and with the Federal Government, in less than 10 years we can complete the necessary works.

Concurrently, our conservation districts working with the Department of Agriculture can complete those jobs necessary to hold the soil on the land. When that is done the floods will work for us. Our erosion can be reduced to negligible proportions, our towns and cities, our marketing centers, all will be safe.

We must never again have flood disaster in Kansas.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has certainly given us a graphic picture of the results of the flood and the damage sustained by the people in the disaster areas. He has also shown a personal and intimate knowledge of the Pick-Sloan plan and the proposals for the prevention of future floods.

However, Mr. President, I wish to say to Members of the Senate that this is not a sudden conversion or show of interest in flood control on the part of the distinguished Senator from Kansas. It was my privilege to serve with him in the House of Representatives for a great many years, when he was a Member of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives. The interest which the Senator from Kansas shows today in flood control he also evinced back in the days of the late thirties and early forties, when he served in the House of Representatives and there had a great deal to do with the legislative enactments authorizing the projects which he is now supporting.

I mention the fact because when floods come and public interest is aroused, it is a nice thing for everyone to say, "This is something I am interested in." It is a sort of bandwagon proposition. The Senator from Kansas, on the other hand, was interested in flood control and in taking steps to prevent such damages

years ago. It was due to his work that some of the structures which have been completed were started. I have in mind particularly Smoky Hill, the Harlan Reservoir in Nebraska, and other projects along the Republican River and the tributaries of the Kaw River. The Senator from Kansas can speak with confidence and good conscience today, because he is not a Johnny Come Lately on the subject of flood control.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the fine remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. It was my privilege to work with him in the House of Representatives for many years. Jointly we worked on a program for complete control of water runoffs. As I stated earlier, it is a coordinated program of soil conservation, detention dams and reservoirs. It is a complete program. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota led the fight for many years for the control of the tributary streams by the construction of small reservoirs in the Case-Wheeler bill. Through the Bureau of Reclamation we have constructed one of those projects in Kansas, and I am hopeful that we can get other projects under way which will do much to control the flood waters of the streams which feed large rivers. I am advised that had we had two or three reservoirs on the tributaries, the Saline and Solomon Rivers in Kansas, it would have materially reduced the flood waters in those streams. At least 20 percent of the flood waters flowed down those streams and added that amount of water to the already swollen flood waters.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the fine approach which he has taken and the information which he has set forth for the benefit of the Senate, especially when we are considering this important type of legislation. The Senator from Kansas has referred most appropriately to one important matter, namely, the proper amount of compensation which should be paid to those who must of necessity suffer the loss of their properties in the event the proposed dams are built. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Kansas if it is not true that considerable difficulty has developed not only in our State of Kansas but in some of the surrounding areas because of what would seem to be an inadequate amount of compensation paid to those who lost homes and farms which had been in their families for generations.

Mr. CARLSON. My distinguished colleague from Kansas raises a point which causes everyone difficulty when it is undertaken to secure land for dam sites or for inundation in a reservoir area, and to acquire easements which are necessary as the flood waters fill the reservoirs.

In our own State cases have arisen which have caused many of us considerable difficulty, and we have not been very happy about some of them. I am sincerely hopeful that when the Corps

of Army Engineers secures titles, easements, and rights-of-way, it will keep in mind the matter I mentioned earlier, namely, that in such circumstances a railroad or public utility or highway or bridge is relocated without cost to the owner, and in being relocated it is constructed in as good condition, if not better condition, than that in which it was before being relocated. In view of that situation, I contend that the farmer is entitled to the same consideration.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). Does the junior Senator from Kansas yield to his colleague?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am sure that my distinguished colleague knows that before these projects are undertaken, they are submitted to the governors of the respective States. I know that my colleague is familiar with that situation, because he was Governor of our State of Kansas. So I am sure he realizes that in Kansas we have been aware of this situation. Let me say—if a personal reference may be pardoned—that I recall that when I was Governor of the State of Kansas, in a number of cases I made a report to the State senate and house of representatives, as provided by law, and to the Army engineers; and in the report I pointed out that while gas lines, transmission lines, and telephone and telegraph systems are rehabilitated, a similar attitude and view are not taken when private citizens are deprived of their property.

I think my colleague has brought out an excellent point today, namely, the need for some type of consideration on the part of the Army engineers for those whose property is taken, so that those who take the property may become aware of the great disparity which exists at times between establishing what is fair value when the owner of land in a valley is deprived of his property, and establishing what is fair value in relocating the property of railroads, utilities, or similar property.

I merely wish to say that I think the reference the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has made to this matter will be most helpful to us in connection with reviewing the difficulties which have been visited on our State. They have been burdensome and heavy, but certainly they could not have been anticipated.

I join him in stressing the point that, inasmuch as we spend billions of dollars for aid to other nations of the world, and that aid comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers of our great country, therefore we should see to it—and I join my colleague in saying this—that some of these funds are used in the areas which have been devastated, so that we shall provide for the folks at home at least as well as we do for those who live in other countries.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the comments of my

colleague, the senior Senator from Kansas, who also served as Governor of our State for a term of 4 years. Of course, one who serves as Governor becomes well aware of the problems incident to the carrying out of a reservoir program. He is especially aware of that problem when he confers with the citizens of his State whose property is affected by the program. My colleague has had some of the same experiences I have had. That is why I desired to call this matter to the attention of the Senate.

I wish to say that, generally speaking and in the over-all view, the Corps of Army Engineers does an excellent job in acquiring these lands. I believe the Army engineers and their representatives will deal justly with our citizens who will be dislocated in the reservoir area.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Kansas on the able and learned address he has made on the subject of flood control. His address shows the enormous amount of thought and study which he has given to this problem.

Does not the difficulty we are having with much of the flood damage arise not so much because of the plan we are pursuing but because we have not had sufficient funds with which to carry out the plans and build the dams? Is it not true that much of the damage which occurred in the Senator's State might have been avoided if the flood-control projects which have been authorized had been constructed, although for one reason or another their construction has been delayed many years?

Mr. CARLSON. The junior Senator from Louisiana is absolutely correct. Had this program been carried out several years ago, the water crest in the valleys would have been materially lowered, and hundreds of millions of dollars of loss would have been avoided. Moreover, the water would have been held back in the tributary streams of our State, instead of being poured into Arkansas and Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that it is poor economy to attempt to save money by too stringently withholding money for flood control, with the result that while we are waiting for the construction of the flood-control projects, we suffer enormous damage because of floods, such as the billion dollar damage to which the Senator has just referred?

Mr. CARLSON. That is absolutely correct. Once a reservoir is built, it protects the valley for many decades.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that one of our committees is considering a bill calling for the appropriation of \$8,000,000,000 for arms and economic aid for other sections of the world. If we are going to continue to shoulder the problems of almost all the other peoples of the world, is it not essential that we see to it that in our own country we have a productive system which will be sufficient to meet our own needs as well as the needs of other peoples?

Mr. CARLSON. There is no doubt that we must maintain a system which will enable us to meet the needs of both ourselves and of other peoples.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Before I conclude, Mr. President, I should like again to pay my respects to the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR], for the very fine way in which he has acted to take care of a flood which was practically over before he undertook the hearings on this measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Inasmuch as both Senators from Kansas are present at this time, I should like to say that in the committee we had this trouble in connection with the hearings on this matter: We had many witnesses from what is known as the Turtle Creek Valley, who wanted to have the plans of the Army engineers followed in connection with the building of a great dam there. Locally, there was the problem that many persons did not wish to be removed from their homes because of the construction of that dam. I can well understand that situation; it is natural for a man not to want to be removed from his home. Also, I understand that the valley is a very beautiful one. However, the plan which was offered by the other side cannot be followed, because we are obligated to follow the recommendations of the head of the Corps of Engineers.

I wish to say to both the Senators from Kansas that in my judgment it would help tremendously if they would use their influence in Kansas to get that situation corrected, because it is more or less a local situation and there should be some means by which the owners of the property can be paid for the just and fair value of their property, of course. If that can be done, I think the Turtle Creek Dam can be started very quickly; I hope it can be started not long after we pass this bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his remarks. I wish to say that I had the privilege of hearing the testimony taken by the committee, both the testimony for and the testimony against this particular proposal. I, too, am hopeful that there can be developed a program which will bring about a realization of the need for the construction of the reservoir, as well as the need for the protection of the people in the valley.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL BOXING CLUB

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished friend and colleague, the junior Senator from my neighboring State of Washington [Mr. CAIN], I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 191) submitted by Mr. WELKER (for himself and Mr. CAIN), was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcom-

mittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full study and investigation of the International Boxing Club with the view to ascertaining whether by restrictive contract practices, or otherwise, such club is preventing or hindering the entrance or advancement of professional boxers in the profession of boxing, or otherwise fostering unlawful restraints or monopolies, in professional boxing; whether or not the International Boxing Club, or any other person, firm, or corporation engaged in the promotion or management of national boxing events are in such control thereof as to deny or preclude opportunity to all those eligible the right to compete for the national boxing title championship; and whether or not the people of the United States are thereby denied full and unrestrained national competition for national boxing titles. The committee shall report the results of such study and investigation to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with its recommendations for such legislation or other action as it deems necessary.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, it is my firm opinion that the boxing profession has lost the confidence and respect of the American people, and that the boxing profession will disappear as a competitive art unless certain monopolistic practices are exposed and eliminated.

Never in history have all sports been so carefully subjected to the searching inquiry of the American people. We, the American people, are a sports-loving people, and I hope that we shall always so remain, but whenever the finger of suspicion is pointed at any sport, that sport is certain to suffer, and the athletes who engage in it will suffer. Therefore, I think it is reasonable to assume that all sports must come clean and are doing so.

In recent months we have had the basketball scandal, with the subsequent investigations. We have had the investigation of baseball, which investigation is now under way on the other side of the Capitol, and in recent days we have seen the scandal of West Point, which points the finger of suspicion at intercollegiate football. We have seen on the floor of the United States Senate two able Senators, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], advocate the abolition of intercollegiate football in our service institutions.

Mr. President, it is my firm opinion that all the sports heretofore mentioned are much cleaner, much more wholesome and more competitive than the professional sport of boxing as conducted today. In the resolution I have sent to the desk, I have asked that the Committee on the Judiciary make a full study and investigation of the International Boxing Club, to ascertain whether it has been engaging in vicious monopolistic contract practices, and whether it has, in fact, by such monopolistic practices, brought professional boxing to near ruin, to the detriment of the profession and many of the boxers. It goes without saying, and I think it is common knowledge, that the International Boxing Club is a closed corporation, which governs and controls the professional boxing business in almost every major city in the United States. It has nearly a wide-open field in the

handling of championship contestants, and as a result of the monopoly it exercises over contestants, promoters and managers, the boxing profession has reached a new low, to a point where it is ruined in the eyes of most of the American people. We have the shocking example, if you please, of fighters owned and controlled by the International Boxing Club, who have long since passed the peak of their fighting ability, and who stumble and wrestle with an opponent in a flimsy exhibition of the art of self-defense, in an attempt to achieve the world's championship, the highest honor that a professional boxer can obtain.

Only last month, Jersey Joe Walcott received his fifth chance for the heavyweight championship of the world. He was successful; and I always was an admirer of his, since he was always the underdog. He is a man either 39 or 40 years of age, the oldest champion-elect in the history of the heavyweight division. I am wondering how many boxing fans would pay \$20 to see our present champion go into the ring against the past illustrious champion of the world and credit to the boxing game, Joe Louis.

Where are the young fighters who can better represent the fistic champions in the ring today? What has happened to all of this material that we have been developing in gymnasiums all over the world and in our different universities? Why has it been on the decline, and why are we forced to watch boxing matches which are arranged by the International Boxing Club, boxing matches which put together two men who are no longer in their prime and who give us, in my opinion, a second-rate performance, to say the least?

Mr. President, I will tell you where the men are, and I will give you one living example of the huge monopoly that is practiced by the International Boxing Club in its complete monopoly of the able fighters of this Nation.

Harry "Kid" Matthews is an Idaho product—as much an Idahoan as William E. Borah, as Idaho potatoes, or as Sun Valley. Harry Matthews was born in Idaho 28½ years ago. I knew him when he was merely a child growing up in my neighboring towns of Ola and Emmett, Idaho. I saw him in one of his first fistic encounters. From that time, I knew his destiny was fame in the professional ring. I watched him grow from a small boy to the greatest uncrowned champion in the United States. I see everything in Harry Matthews to admire. He is a fine family man and a devout Christian. He was a combat soldier in World War II, and distinguished himself and the Nation he fought for. As I stated a moment ago, he is a professional boxer, one whom I proudly call my friend. He has the amazing record of 94 professional bouts. Of these, Harry Matthews has won 53 by knockouts, 32 decisions, and 6 having ended in draws. My friend, Harry Matthews, has in his entire career been defeated only 3 times. I should tell my friends and this Nation that this distinguished American has won his last 59 consecutive bouts, and I ask anyone in this Nation to compare a

top-flight fighter who can match that record.

A few years ago Harry Matthews was taken over by Jack Hurley, a gentleman I know by reputation only as one of the most respected and honest managers in the prize-fighting profession. Under the able leadership of Mr. Hurley, Harry Matthews has won 24 out of 24 prize fights, 19 of which were by knockout and 5 by decision.

Mr. President, on March 2, 1951, I proudly watched my friend, Harry Matthews, by television, as this country boy from Idaho came into the famous Madison Square Garden in New York to fight one of the leading prize fighters in the light-heavyweight division, "Irish" Bob Murphy. Many thousands of tickets were sold and this fight was billed that the winner would meet Joey Maxim for the world championship. Mr. President, Harry Matthews met "Irish" Bob Murphy, on that date, and decisively whipped him, and I think the decision was overwhelming. In fact, I remember that one judge voted 8 to 2. Mr. "Irish" Bob Murphy, the defeated gladiator, fights most generally for the International Boxing Club, and notwithstanding the fact that he was beaten all over the ring in Madison Square Garden on the night of March 2, the fact remains that Harry Matthews lives now in his adopted home in Seattle, Wash., picking up a fight and winning a fight wherever he can find one; but the man he so overwhelmingly defeated in March of this year, "Irish" Bob Murphy, due to the monopoly and the restraint of trade that International Boxing Club holds over professional fighters, the man who was whipped and beaten, instead of Harry Matthews, is getting the chance at the world's championship against Joey Maxim.

Mr. President, the people of the entire West, where champions are rare, are asking what happened to Harry "Kid" Matthews. Why is he not being given the chance for the world's championship—the chance that he earned by honest athletic endeavor and the chance that was promised to him? Mr. President, not only the people of the West, but the people of this Nation are asking that same question. Some 25,000,000 spectators through television and radio saw my Idaho friend go to the heights that no Idahoan has ever achieved in boxing. Some 25,000,000 people ask: "What happened to Harry 'Kid' Matthews?" and my answer to those 25,000,000 people is that because Harry "Kid" Matthews is not owned and controlled by the International Boxing Club—because he refuses to sell a share here and share there of his body to professional racketeers—Harry Matthews is left at the station, and right at the peak of his career he is denied the championship fight that was promised to him. Yes, I say this: that the International Boxing Club has with premeditated design attempted to bypass the ability of Harry Matthews. I say, that after Murphy was decisively beaten by Matthews, Murphy was fed, by the International Boxing Club, a series of small fights around the country until fans forgot

about the Matthews victory over Murphy, and that in July the master minds of the boxing game—the International Boxing Club—set up another one of its "house" fighters, Jake LaMotta, in the ring with Murphy, with the winner again to meet Maxim for the light-heavyweight championship of the world. So on August 22 the red-blooded fight fans of America will see an injustice perpetrated upon them when they pay to see or listen to the Murphy-Maxim fight, because in honesty and justice, in fairness and decency, the match should be Matthews versus Maxim.

I am mindful of the fact, Mr. President, that we have very serious matters in this Nation much more important than boxing, baseball and what-not, but are we, as Senators, going to sit idly by and permit a monopoly to exist right in our faces, and permit one of the greatest of American sports to deteriorate and to go into disrepute? I am a great believer in competition, both physical and mental, and I have had a great deal of satisfaction over engaging in and following the prize-fight profession since I was a youth. Therefore, I say that it is my duty to be interested in America to the extent that I shall attempt to expose this vicious monopolistic practice which is handled by the International Boxing Club. I realize, and I have been told, that it is all-powerful, that it controls the boxing profession, and that I will be wasting my time to sponsor this resolution. That may be true, Mr. President, but I assure the International Boxing Club that it will promote honest competitive fights or I shall ask the reason why, as long as I am in public life. The International Boxing Club is never going to be permitted to squeeze Harry Matthews or any other athlete out of the laurels that are his, by virtue of its monopoly so long as I have a voice in the Senate of the United States. I hate little vicious cliques that band together to buy this or that piece of someone, and who then control the destiny of not only one prize fighter but the destiny of most championships in our Nation. It amounts to flesh peddling and it has no place in America, especially in a highly competitive field such as boxing. So I ask the Senate of the United States, What constitutes monopoly? Is not the International Boxing Club operating in restraint of trade with interstate products when such athletes as Harry Matthews are refused a chance at the championship of the world when it has been promised to him, and which he has richly earned?

I want the Committee on the Judiciary, or some other committee, to ascertain why he was refused that fight. Was it because he would not agree to sign a long-term contract with the International Boxing Club, or was it because he refused to sell a share of his body and his talent to certain of the men closely identified with this club? Mr. President, the American people are demanding these answers, and not just the Senator from Idaho.

I am mindful of the accusations which might be made against me, that I am doing a job of assessment work for my

friend, Harry Matthews; but I wish to say to the Senate that I am not alone in my demands for a full and complete examination of the International Boxing Club and of its treatment of Harry Matthews. My distinguished friend and colleague from the great State of Washington will soon address the Senate on his observations of the treatment which Harry Matthews, who has adopted residence in his State, has received.

Mr. President, how do the prize-fight people of America feel when they pick up the August 1951 issue of Ring magazine, whose president and editor is Nat Fleischer, who writes on page 20 of the August issue as follows:

Now that Joey Maxim has proved that he is a far better light-heavyweight than he is a heavy, he should settle down to business and give those in his division who have qualified as challengers, a chance to fight for his crown. The outstanding men in the division are Archie Moore and Harry Matthews.

Each has been clamoring for a championship bout and each continues to keep in the fistful spotlight as a contender. If boxing commissions throughout our country were more alert and stopped playing politics in an effort to get lucrative contests for their territory, Maxim long ago would have been forced to defend his crown or vacate it. The same was true of Ike Williams, who was recently deposed by James Carter.

Dodging legitimate challengers is a pastime that is engaged in by most champions but it wasn't that way before boxing became a huge commercial business. We would like to see Maxim defend his crown against Harry Matthews since he and Jack Kearns, his manager, declare that Moore is no drawing card. At least Matthews is, and that's more than can be said of Maxim and Charles as attractions in their recent fight. Had Matthews instead of Maxim been pitted against Charles, I'd be willing to wager dollars to doughnuts that at least twice the gathering would have been present for such a contest with a gate of upward of \$150,000.

Matthews is the logical man for Maxim. He rates above Bob Satterfield and should be given first crack at the crown. He can box. He can punch. He has a fighting heart and is most colorful. He's an excellent drawing card who would do well against either Maxim or Charles but it's Joey he's after and not Ezzard.

It's too bad that a fighter like Matthews is kept on the side lines by the International Boxing Club while lesser lights who cannot draw half as well are given preference because of protective measures. The IBC apparently cannot handle Matthews' manager, the colorful Jack Hurley, and that's the reason for shunning Matthews.

In California, a bill has been introduced in the assembly aimed specifically at the International Boxing Club and its control of most champions and top-ranking fighters. The measure would prevent any fight promoter or fight club which controls or holds an interest in a boxer from being allowed to "share or participate in promotion of a prize fight in California." The State Athletic Commission would be prohibited from issuing a license for any fight in which any agent other than the manager of the boxer received a share of the latter's purse.

Assemblyman Maloney, of San Francisco, father of the bill, and George D. Collins, cosponsor, declared:

We aim at breaking the fistful monopoly of the New York club, the IBC, which recently received a fat share of the \$95,000 receipts of the Andy Walker against Joe Louis fight in San Francisco and the Charles-Pat Valentino mill. In each case, the promoter, Bill Kyne and later Kyne and Jim Murray, gave either a guaranty or a percentage to the IBC.

Is this matter serious? I read a United Press dispatch from Seattle, Wash., on August 9 that the Attorney General of Washington, Smith Troy, was preparing a suit against International Boxing Club over its treatment of Harry Matthews.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to listen again to what the leader of boxing in America, Nat Fleischer, has to say in part:

Now Joe and Floyd are brothers in arms with Jim Norris (of the International Boxing Club) and they've made good their boast with vengeance. They haven't broken the monopoly, but they have cornered the market on world title bouts and other major contests.

Mr. President, in the September issue of Ring magazine for 1951 this great leader and writer of boxing in America has this to say, and I quote from page 16 of Ring magazine:

Following Murphy's victory an announcement was made by Jim Norris, of the International Boxing Club, that in a conference with Doc Kearns, manager of Maxim, an agreement was reached to have Maxim defend his light-heavyweight crown against either Murphy or Bob Satterfield in August in New York.

No mention of the most deserving challenger, Matthews, was made until one of the scribes asked about Jack Hurley's great fighter. Norris declared that he had offered Matthews several opponents in New York, Detroit, and Chicago. Each had been turned down, but the door was not locked.

"If he wants to fight for the IBC and is willing to accept our terms, we are ready to talk business," said Norris. One could read between the lines that Matthews had been pushed aside to make way for the man whom he beat.

This is unjust and unsportsmanlike in boxing, as in all other sports. I hope sportsmanship still rules. Matthews has earned a title shot. He is a scientific boxer and tremendously powerful hitter. He proved his worth in beating Murphy.

I'm certain that if it were left to Bob, the Irish lad would stand aside to let his conqueror try his hand against Maxim and then take his chance on meeting the winner.

Matthews, more than even our No. 1 rated light heavyweight, Archie Moore, has earned the right to a championship match. He is entitled to it more than is Murphy.

The public will come out for a Murphy-Maxim fight because of their hero worship, but they'll do the same to see Jack Hurley's man tackle Maxim. The fair thing is to give Matthews first crack at Joey, then let Murphy have a second try at Harry if Matthews succeeds in winning the crown.

That's the squarest way of handling the light-heavyweight problem. If the NBA and New York commission want to help an honest, honorable fight manager, Jack Hurley, and an equally honorable fighter, get their just dues, they should use their good offices to obtain the title bout for Matthews.

Though Hurley has declared that he will never again appear in the Garden or any

IBC promotion where television will keep down the gate, things have changed in recent weeks.

The banning of television in IBC promotions until the October indoor season contracts get under way for another year, should be considered favorably by Hurley, even though a bout with Maxim would be staged after the new contracts begin.

If Matthews should beat Maxim, he would come in for the big dough in future fights and that would be ample recompense for settling his feud with Jim Norris. The IBC needs Matthews as much as Harry and Hurley need the International Boxing Club and since boxing involves business, it is up to Hurley to quit fighting the International Boxing Club.

Norris is fooling no one when he says Matthews can come into the Garden at any time and that he also is being considered for a winter title match. That will never happen unless Hurley and Jim get together.

Many years have elapsed since such a field of excellent light-heavyweight talent has appeared in world boxing. Moore, for a number of years our number one contender; Matthews, Murphy, Cockell, Harold Johnson, and Don Bucceroni—it's been a long time since such men have graced the top sector of the division. Here's the chance of a lifetime for a big time promotion and Norris and Hurley should make the most of it.

In conclusion, Mr. President, there is very little else that I can say. I have given the Senate a word picture of the monopoly as exercised by the International Boxing Club. If this resolution is adopted I want the committee not only to investigate the International Boxing Club but any other person, club, or commission that rears its ugly head in competitive boxing and seeks to assert monopolistic control over the boxing profession. Let us not waste our time by mere perfunctory examination but let us get to the meat of the boxing profession that we have seen fall into disrepute in recent years. There must be a reason. American youth still loves to fight for prizes and for wealth, but we now have seen the boxing profession go down to a point where our athletes are old, and not real champions. They have served their time and they can be completely defeated if they are given a fight with a youthful competitor. We have seen the contestants owned, operated, and controlled by clubs and individuals who control the entire boxing business. This must stop. Baseball, as it is being investigated on the other side of the Capitol at this moment, is a wholesome, clean profession beyond disgrace and will ever rest upon a high level because baseball itself cleaned house. Boxing has failed to clean house.

I have told the Senate the story, as I know it, about IBC and Harry Matthews. Senators can see what it has done to the light-heavyweight division of professional boxing. I am sure other Senators are familiar with many other contestants who have been foreclosed the right to go to the top of the ladder in the competitive field of boxing.

I trust that the resolution will be the effective means of completely airing the story of monopoly in boxing.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as the cosponsor of the resolution which has just

been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I wish to submit some views.

In recent days a considerable amount of interest has been shown by several Members of the Congress and a number of sports-minded lay persons in the possibility and desirability of an investigation of professional boxing by appropriate committees of the Congress.

On August 6, Representative L. GARY CLEMENTE, of New York, submitted a resolution to investigate the professional sport of boxing. The resolution was referred to the House Rules Committee.

On August 10 my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, submitted a resolution to pursue the same inquiry. This resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Some 2 weeks ago the attorney general of the State of Washington, Mr. Smith Troy, stated publicly that he was going to request the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. J. Howard McGrath, to undertake an investigation of professional boxing.

It has been requested by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] that the resolution he has offered today be referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The resolution directs that a full study and investigation be made of the International Boxing Club.

The several resolutions in question and all of the interest in the several resolutions are directed to the same end. It is hoped that some appropriate committee of the Congress will endeavor to determine if qualified and talented professional prize fighters are being denied opportunities to compete for championships in the various boxing classes. Certainly the junior Senator from Idaho and the junior Senator from Washington have no particular pride of authorship in the resolution which has been sent to the desk today. We will gladly assist and testify before any committee of the Congress which may undertake the study of professional boxing which is desired.

It seems to me that the presentation of professional boxing which, through the medium of television, is viewed in millions of American homes, is in need of a complete and thorough congressional study to determine whether, through illegal or questionable promotional or managerial monopoly, or both, the American public is being deprived of performance by the best available talent and whether outstanding talent is being shunted aside regardless of proven qualifications in the interest of other less able talent controlled by promotional or managerial monopolies, or both.

The mission of professional sports, including boxing, is that of playing an important part in the American sports picture by stressing the value of competition, which has already contributed greatly to the good of our country, and by setting examples of the highest ideals of sportsmanship, as well as proving the value of physical fitness.

In these premises, it is thought by some of us that professional boxing is presently maintained on a level far below the normal principles and ideals of sportsmanship.

Championship boxing bouts in recent years have not always been conducted in a manner to inspire the youth of America. Champions have not always conducted themselves in a manner described by the simple dictionary explanation of the word "champion."

I can best illustrate this viewpoint by describing several examples. Among boxing students and authorities, it is generally conceded that Harry Matthews of Seattle, Wash., is an outstanding light-heavyweight challenger, who is presently being denied an opportunity to fight for the championship of his class. Within a few days, Joey Maxim the light-heavyweight champion, will defend his title against Irish Bob Murphy. The latter has been very successful in the past several years and is likely to defeat the champion who has fought, but seldom in recent years—and when he did, he did it not very well. It happens that Matthews and Murphy fought not long ago and the announced understanding was that the winner would be matched against the champion. Matthews completely outclassed Murphy in every way. For reasons which the Congress ought to determine the understanding was not carried out, and Murphy is now being given a chance to win a great title, while Matthews, acknowledged to be Murphy's superior in every respect, is being denied the chance which he has earned completely.

I wish to say, Mr. President, as the Senator from Idaho has said, that Harry Matthews is a product of the sovereign and illustrious State of Idaho. However, Harry Matthews has lived as a constituent of mine in the State of Washington for some time. Along with every other sports-minded citizen in the State of Washington, I share in the pride which the State of Idaho has for a very splendid and vigorous young American.

Archie Moore, of Missouri, is another outstanding example of an outstanding challenger for the light heavyweight title who has been denied the opportunity to fight for the championship of his class. It is my understanding that Archie Moore has now reached the point where he is over the hill, and on the other side, on his way down to oblivion, after having been an outstanding contender for years, and always denied an opportunity to win a championship match.

I have often heard it said by those in the sport who ought to know that many a good boxer, who is ably managed, is prevented from getting his foot inside of the door until he "cuts in" part of his managerial fees to some member of a New York managerial monopoly. I do not know how much truth there may be in this contention. A competent congressional inquiry would determine the facts.

On Wednesday of this week Joe Louis will box Jimmy Bivins in Baltimore. This bout will be promoted by the International Boxing Club, which many know as the Madison Square Garden of New York. I remember that when Joe Louis boxed Tom Roper in Los Angeles some years ago the bout was promoted by Mike Jacobs, of New York. When Joe Louis boxed Buddy Baer here in Washington that contest was promoted by Mike

Jacobs, and the referee was imported from New York.

It may be recalled that when Joe Louis and Billy Conn, both men then being in the Army, offered to box for the benefit of war charities, the offer never materialized because the New York promoter, Mike Jacobs, insisted upon collecting from the gate receipts a certain sum of money which Jacobs claimed Joe Louis owed to him. How Mr. Jacobs could have maintained this attitude in the face of a New York statute I do not know. This statute says in part:

No corporation shall have, either directly or indirectly, any financial interest in a boxer—competing on premises owned or leased by a corporation or in which such corporation is otherwise interested.

The value of professional boxing ought to be weighed objectively as a national sport, stressing the sports contribution to the combat-mindedness of our Nation, for this combat instinct cannot be fostered in a Nation by means of canasta and croquet.

While such great sports as football and baseball teach the tremendous value of team play as applied to every walk of life, boxing produces characteristics and values peculiar to that strenuous sport. Boxing teaches the will to stand alone and to fight alone without the help of team mates who will block out a tackle or advance a base runner by a sacrifice bunt. There come times in the lives of all of us, and most particularly in the lives of those who serve in uniform under fire, when we must stand alone and fight it out alone. In preparation for such an emergency, boxing teaches one not to quit when the going is rough and tough. Military leaders stress the value of boxing as the basis of hand-to-hand conflict. The man who knows the correct block, side-step, and counter will instinctively employ the correct tactics whether the opposition be a fellow wearing boxing gloves or an enemy armed with knife or bayonet.

This is not to say that only graduates of the prize-fight ring make good hand-to-hand fighters, but it does stress the value of boxing tactics, which are impressed upon all of those who witness boxing bouts.

Professional boxing is not the sole property of promoters or groups of promoters. The sport belongs to the American public, which has the right to expect the best presentation of the sport, and ought not to be subjected to a forced diet of mediocre, second-, or third-best boxing bouts when better bouts are available.

For many years the boxing commissions of the various States of the Union have been banded together in the National Boxing Association. Its membership included commissions from foreign countries as well as from municipal commissions. A total of 86 boxing commissioners belong to the National Boxing Association.

It is a singular fact that New York has constantly declined to join this "Union of States" formed in the interest of sportsmanship, uniformity, cooperation, and control. The National Boxing Association will hold its thirty-first

annual convention in Chicago next month. I have been told by some of its officers that the problems to be discussed in that convention are the same ones which concern me now and will be of concern to any committee of the Congress which undertakes a study of professional boxing in America. It goes without saying that the National Boxing Association will cooperate in any investigation which may be undertaken by any committee of the Congress.

I have gladly joined with the Senator from Idaho in urging that the Congress undertake an investigation of professional boxing. There are few among us who ever have been a part of professional boxing. We may have little appreciation of or sympathy for this sport. That, however, is not what now concerns us. For as long as professional boxing is a legitimate sport we must make as certain as we can that every qualified fighter is given a chance to compete for the championship, and that monopolistic control does not prevent the American public from witnessing the best matches which can be arranged. It is because of this reasonable opinion that I have joined with the Senator from Idaho and with other interested parties in urging that an appropriate committee of the Congress undertake a thorough examination of the health and procedures of professional boxing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With my colleague's permission and the permission of the Senator from Idaho I should like to join in the sentiments expressed here today during the presentation of the facts on this subject.

Mr. President, I have no pride of authorship in the resolution which I have prepared. I have been thinking about this subject for some time, because of my long friendship with Mr. Hurley, with whom I grew up in Minnesota. Also, the individual about whom we are talking comes from Idaho and the Pacific Northwest, and now resides in Seattle.

Approximately 4 or 5 days ago I received a letter from the attorney general of the State of Washington. I then directed my staff to prepare a resolution. It so happened that it was ready for submission at the same time the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Washington evidenced a similar desire. I did not know of the activities of the Senator from Idaho and my colleague from Washington. However, we are all trying to achieve the same end. I hope such an investigation as has been proposed may be conducted. The facts have been very well presented by the Senator from Idaho and my colleague from Washington.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, being one of the authors of the resolution sent to the desk, I wish to state that we are delighted, thrilled, and honored to have the able help and association of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington. We will gladly work with him.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to my colleague that I take it that all of us are in agreement. We

hope that many other persons will soon become familiar with the subject. Fundamentally, our only ambition is to see that every qualified American has the opportunity to fight for the championship of his class. It is a good thing, in a personal way, for the two Senators from Washington and the Senator from Idaho to conspire, as it were, for the success and happiness of an individual, Harry Matthews, whom we know and respect, and who happens to have been brought up in our part of the Northwest.

CIVIL-FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments regarding the pending bill. As a Member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions it has been my privilege to attend practically all of the hearings which were conducted on the pending appropriation bill. The hearings began on the 28th of June and continued until July 30. During that time the committee was in session both mornings and afternoons of most days. I do not know the exact number of witnesses whom the committee heard, but it was in excess of 100. There were hundreds of others who manifested interest in and support of the bill by their presence. They were not merely people from Washington. They were people from practically every State in the Union. They were people who live in areas which have flood control problems, or have need of water conservation, or have great potentials of hydroelectric power, which, when developed, would strengthen the economy in those sections of our country.

When I first became a Member of Congress, in 1935, I had little knowledge and very little interest in flood control, river and harbor, and water resources development. Prior to the time that I campaigned for Congress in 1934 the principal flood I had heard of was the one for which Noah had built his ark. When I got into the campaign I found that my district extended down the Arkansas River to its mouth and to the Mississippi River. There was a very acute flood control problem in that particular area at that time. A proposal was pending which was known as the Jadwin plan. It became my responsibility, and I immediately became interested in flood-control legislation. I sought assignment to the House Flood Control Committee, and was successful in obtaining the assignment. There I served during the 4 years I was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas and I entered the House of Representatives at the same time. Both of us became members of the Flood Control Committee. I am familiar with the hard work the Senator

did on the problems which were of direct concern to him, particularly with reference to some floodways. We sat in hearings day after day, week in and week out, and month in and month out. It was very educational. I know of no one who took a greater personal interest than did the Senator from Arkansas in the problem of flood control, not only as affecting the streams which flow across his State, but in the problem of flood control throughout the Nation. It was a privilege to work with him during those years, as it is pleasant to be associated with him again in this work in the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I remember those days when he and I were members of the Committee on Flood Control in the House, and my association with him at that time was very pleasant, just as it has been in the Senate. I recall that he and I were both struggling along with this new responsibility, and were trying to learn something about it and get our bearings. It was there that I got the initial concept of the great economic potentiality of our national water resources.

From that time on I have been a strong advocate of flood control to protect our soil, our valleys, and the inhabitants of the valleys and their property, and I have realized also, as I now realize more keenly than ever before, the great economic resources and potentialities which we have and which we can develop from the great natural resource, water.

Mr. President, I believe the State of Arkansas has as many miles of navigable rivers as any other State in the Union, if not more. Therefore, we have tremendous flood-control problems. I may say that most of that mileage is in rich, fertile valleys. In the upper regions of some of the tributaries there is a hilly section and a small mountainous area, where there is not much land that can be developed for cultivation. In that area we have the potentiality of great hydroelectric resources. As we construct those dams we not only develop the power which will repay the cost of construction, but we build multipurpose dams, which make great contributions to flood control in the rich alluvial valleys, and make it possible, along with levees, cut-offs, and other improvements, to fully protect those valleys and enable the people to go in there and make investments and thoroughly develop them into their full economic strength.

Mr. President, that explains why I am vitally interested in this character of legislation and in appropriations for this purpose. As I learn about the possibilities of my own State in this particular area of progress, I also am able to envision fairly well what such development means to other sections of our country and what it means to the economic strength and power of our great United States of America.

Mr. President, I have stood on this floor on more than one occasion and talked about economy in Government. I doubt if I need yield to any of my colleagues in respect to the depth of my sincerity in what I have had to say about

the necessity for economy in this Government. I grant to others the same sincerity that I ascribe to myself. I believe that practically every Member of this body, under the present fiscal strain, is genuinely concerned about economy and is trying to pursue sound fiscal policies.

It is true that in our compelling necessity to economize, we could refuse to make appropriations for any flood-control works, for any river and harbor projects, for any development of our natural resources. By so doing, we could eliminate all the items of this bill. I believe this bill calls for appropriations totaling \$637,000,000, and we could avoid all of that expenditure by simply refusing to vote for any of the projects provided for in the bill. However, in that event, we would have to take losses, because certain contracts have been made. By following such a course, although we seemingly would avoid the expenditure of \$637,000,000, nevertheless we would incur substantial losses, probably equal to that amount or at least equal to a considerable portion of it, by reason of discontinuing projects which already are under construction and leaving exposed areas which will be protected when the works provided for in this appropriation bill are completed.

I do not believe anyone can successfully challenge the statement that such a course would be the rankest sort of false economy, Mr. President. To stop such programs to stop developing any of our resources which make our Nation stronger economically and afford protection to property and investments and create a livelihood for our people in the valleys, would simply be to turn back the clock and stop progress and go into reverse gear, so to speak. Thus, instead of strengthening our Nation, as will be done by continuing the construction of these projects, the economic strength of our Nation would be weakened, and our military might and power would thus be impaired.

Mr. President, it is not practical to follow such a course. It would be unwise to do so; it would be stupid to do so.

Therefore, as we approach the problem of making the necessary appropriations for carrying on this program and meeting this problem, we approach it on the basis of what we can afford to do, as measured against what we cannot afford not to do; and in that process we have presented this bill, which lies somewhere between the two extremes, and represents as near a middle course as the collective wisdom and judgment of the Appropriations Committee could find.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he considers it more important to develop the resources of our own country and to prevent floods which destroy life and property, rather than to

continue in the way that the State Department apparently intends to do—for example, with the \$25,000,000 which has been allocated to Iran and with the loans which we make to Mexico for irrigation development and flood-control development there, without mentioning 8 or 10 other areas in foreign countries, with which no doubt the Senator is just as familiar as I am? Does the distinguished Senator from Arkansas consider it necessary for us to examine and consider our own resources and to treat our own country on a basis at least equal to that on which we treat the other nations of the world, in connection with the spending of our own money for irrigation, flood control, and power development?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that before I conclude, I intend to make a comparison and to place in the Record some calculations I have made, which clearly indicate that even with the appropriations made in this bill and those made in other measures already enacted at this session and those carried in other appropriation bills which will be enacted—for instance, the appropriations for reclamation work, in connection with the Department of the Interior appropriation bill—the total of such expenditures, including those carried in this bill, is hardly a drop in the bucket as compared with the over-all expenditures we shall be called upon to make this year.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator about the following situation: For 50 years our flood-control policy has been to depend largely on the reports of the Army engineers, which are scrutinized carefully by the congressional committees; and whenever the revenue from such projects is greater than the cost, the difference is returned to the Treasury. I am sure that the Senator from Arkansas agrees with me that in the case of irrigation developments, it is necessary, whenever—following a proper investigation by the Department of the Interior—such a development is found to be feasible, to have the cost of the project, without interest, repaid on a definite amortization basis, whereas in connection with power development in the main the policy has been to repay the cost to the United States Government with interest.

In connection with following that long-established policy and developing our own country along that line, does the Senator agree with me that it would be well for the various committees of the Senate, rather than the State Department, to examine closely the proposed expenditures in foreign countries and to consider them on the same basis? In other words, instead of simply making the grants under the point 4 program or the Export-Import Bank program or the World Bank program, or the ECA program, or the Marshall plan, or any one of a dozen other tricks to get money out of the United States Treasury, without repayment, would not it be better for us to proceed at least on the basis that is used in connection with our own devel-

opment, and to study such proposals on that basis? As a shining example, we have the allocation of \$25,000,000 to Iran probably without any hope of repayment. That allocation is made in the hope of quieting the oil situation in Iran. Why should we spend \$25,000,000 of our money in that way, and at the same time support England in her position? It seems to me a little queer, to say the least, to have us do both of those things. I do not understand that situation.

Does not the Senator from Arkansas think we should treat our own country on a basis at least equal to that on which we treat foreign countries, in connection with the spending of our own money?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say to the Senator that in my opinion the basis should not be simply an equal one, but we should take care of our own people first.

Mr. MALONE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Without attempting to debate the merits of the Marshall plan aid to Greece and Turkey or other foreign aid, is it not a fact that Congress can completely end such programs whenever it sees fit to do so, whereas if we leave in the pending appropriation bill all provisions for the commencement of new projects, we shall be committed to the expenditure of between \$5,000,000,000 and \$6,000,000,000; and if we accept the Missouri Valley program and all the other valley programs and the St. Lawrence seaway program, we shall add projects calling for an additional \$25,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000? In connection with all such programs, is it not said that once we begin them, we cannot stop them?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course we should not stop them once they are started.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President, I do not think that can be said.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee why it cannot be said.

Mr. McKELLAR. For instance, let us consider the four new projects provided for in the pending measure. This bill provides for only four new projects, and only \$35,000,000 is estimated for them. The total cost of those projects, when they are completed, will amount to considerably more than that, but nothing like billions of dollars. In just a minute I shall give the Senator the exact figures.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can state the exact figures; they were stated to our committee, for the five projects which I do not think should be provided for in the bill. They total \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is mistaken about that. All the new projects call for just a little more than \$500,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I refer to the four big dams and the one floodway. We were told that they would cost \$500,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Elimination of them now would, it is true, save \$28,500,000, but that is only a beginning.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator said \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will examine the RECORD, he will find that he said that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then it was a lapsus linguae. I certainly intended to say \$500,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator, I take it, admits that he said \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But the projects in the bill were between \$5,000,000,000 and \$6,000,000,000; and the Senator from Virginia repeats that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is mistaken, and I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that the RECORD would not bear him out. The committee hearings would not bear him out. The Senator did not hear the testimony. The Senator was present but about 15 minutes during the entire time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Tennessee is exaggerating.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I am not exaggerating. The Senator came to the committee room to talk about the Buggs Island project for about 15 minutes; then he came in after Buggs Island project had been included, and he left again in less than 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia was there for a good many hours, until he gave up all hope of stopping anything in the bill. After that he did not go any more.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is opposed to this bill now, and he has been opposed to it all the time. I advise him to vote against it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will permit me to make one observation, it has been a little mysterious to the junior Senator from Nevada, during the four and a half years he has been a Member of the Senate, to observe what a great scare it throws into individual Senators when \$1,000,000,000 is mentioned in connection with flood control, rivers and harbors, irrigation and reclamation, or power development in this country, whereas \$8,000,000,000 is taken for granted as hardly worth studying when it is to go to foreign nations for the same purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That may be true. My position with reference to these projects is that, in the first place, no project should be started until it is thoroughly surveyed and appraised as to its economic value, and until its economic value is weighed as against its cost; that is, until there is a comparison between estimated benefits and estimated costs. Then, once it is determined that it is sound economically, as fast as the Government can afford to do so without weakening its fiscal policy, the projects should be constructed. It does not at all frighten me to have someone say that there are probably in America projects of this character which would require an additional \$10,000,000,000 or \$15,000,-

000,000, to construct and to which we are looking forward.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think there are quite that many more.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are probably more than that.

Mr. President, while it has been said on the floor this afternoon that we cannot control floods on every little stream in the United States—with which I agree, too—nevertheless I say that America will become economically stronger and stronger and more productive as we consider, initiate, and build projects of this character, which are worth while and which are sound economically. America's strength will grow in proportion to the speed with which we are able to carry forward this program and to develop the great resources which are latent in our waters and in our streams and in our valleys.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree 100 percent with the Senator. He is entirely correct. I know from the experience in my own State that the building of dams and the use of cheap electricity have done more for farmers probably than for any other class of people. They have done more good, probably, than any other public project within the State. I would a thousand times rather spend \$622,000,000 in order to build big projects in this country than to turn \$8,500,000,000 over to someone, to be spent in countries in Europe or elsewhere, when we do not know how it is to be spent, and when there are no limitations whatsoever upon its spending.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator, the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I want to pay this tribute to him, Mr. President, at this time. He was present at these hearings, as I recall, every minute of the time during that period of over 30 days that hearings were held, except for the few minutes he was absent one morning by reason of a conference with the President at the White House. He conducted the hearings in such a manner as to develop as thoroughly as possible, on the basis of the available evidence, the merit or lack of merit of the requests which came before the committee. He worked diligently. I was happy to serve with him, because I feel that in this work we are actually serving the Nation, when we examine the proposals thoroughly, and then, even in a time of economic stress such as the present, submit recommendations that money be spent to construct the projects. We do it because we have examined them and have gone thoroughly into them and have found that their construction will not be an expense to the Government, in the proper analysis, but an investment in property which will be productive of opportunities for livelihood for generations yet unborn, and which will increase the productive capacity of the Nation and will help us meet the challenge when the day comes, when the dark hour is upon us, if another world war should be inevitable.

When the final test comes, Mr. President, in my judgment, the determining factor will be, How strong are we here in America? not How much money did you give away to foreign countries? Our strength here is going to determine whether communism is to sweep the world, or whether it is to fail in its final attack, in that supreme assault, when it is made. Yes, I know we are spending money in foreign countries. I have been willing to spend part of it. I voted for a reduction in ECA funds every time I had the opportunity, because, as has been suggested or implied here this afternoon, I think in that many instances we spent \$2 when \$1 would have done the job. I suppose we are not able to go abroad to survey projects there as we do the projects in America. They are not examined so carefully; but we spend the money. I have been willing to do that, and I am still willing to help to some extent. I am still willing to go along on helping to arm them. But I have about concluded that it is time to discontinue the economic aid that we have been giving. The countries whom we have aided now have greater productive capacity than they had before the beginning of World War II. If, after we have rehabilitated them to that extent, they cannot go forward, if that does not give them the necessary momentum to enable them to be self-sustaining, I do not know, Mr. President, but it would seem to me that some have in mind such a program should continue indefinitely, and I know that would not be wise for them nor for us. The economic-aid program should end at some time. I think that time is about here.

Mr. President, in that connection, I should like to refer to Senate bill 1762, which I have before me. It is a bill to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international security. The bill is now before the Foreign Relations Committee, where hearings, I think, are now being held on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, before he leaves the subject we were discussing, relative to the new dams which are to be started, and which are authorized by this bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will wait a moment, until I give these figures, I shall then be glad to yield to him. These figures will fit in with what we are discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to wait.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I find in this bill, S. 1762, authority to appropriate \$1,675,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

It authorizes \$125,000,000 for economic aid and technical assistance to Africa and the Near East. It authorizes \$262,500,000 for economic and technical assistance in those portions of the Far East which the President deems to be not under Communist control, and an additional \$22,000,000 is authorized for technical assistance in the Western Hemisphere. These sums so authorized total \$2,197,000,000, which it is proposed

we give away as economic aid and technical assistance to foreign countries during this fiscal year. It is not military assistance. Proposed military assistance in the bill runs to over \$6,000,000,000. But, Mr. President, I am able to identify in the bill \$2,197,000,000 for economic aid unrelated to military assistance.

I am very happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, but I did want to get those basic figures into the Record.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is exactly right.

I want the Record to show that the new projects authorized, on which we will spend about \$28,500,000 this year, are as follows:

Ice Harbor, lock and dam, in the State of Washington, \$95,899,000.

The Dalles, Oreg., lock and dam, \$326,366,000.

Old Hickory, lock and dam, in Tennessee, \$49,120,000.

Gavins Point, Nebr., \$44,900,000; making a total of \$516,285,000.

The billions do not appear in those figures at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I want to make a comparison. We have spent over \$30,000,000,000, in the past 5 years, for the assistance of nations abroad. I do not recall the exact figure, but it exceeds \$30,000,000,000. We are proposing this year to spend approximately eight and a half billion dollars. A little over \$6,000,000,000 of that is identified as military aid. But the \$2,197,000,000 is not military aid; it is for economic assistance, some of which will be spent in those countries for constructing similar projects to those contained in this bill. How many such projects there are and how much of the money will be spent for that purpose I do not know. It has been estimated by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his remarks this afternoon that we will spend about \$80,000,000,000 this year. I think it will be more than that. From what I can anticipate as a member of the Appropriations Committee, we will appropriate—of course, it will not all be spent this year—something close to \$90,000,000,000. I could be wrong about that, but the amount is somewhere between \$80,000,000,000 and \$100,000,000,000 that we shall appropriate. The \$637,000,000 in this bill for the construction of flood control, river and harbor projects, plus \$229,000,000 in the Interior Department appropriation bill for reclamation projects, makes a total of \$866,401,735 that we are appropriating this year, assuming this bill shall pass—\$866,000,000 that we are appropriating for the development of these great vital resources, for the maintenance of the projects already constructed, and for the operation of such facilities.

Let us make a comparison, Mr. President. If we appropriate around \$90,000,000,000 this year, \$866,000,000-plus is only .96 percent of the total expenditures we shall make. In other words, Mr. President, out of every dollar we shall spend this year, less than one penny of each dollar will be expended for the development of these great resources which are self-liquidating. Many of them are self-liquidating because of the power

they produce. Taking it as a whole, these projects will produce far more revenue in a reasonable period of time, say, 20 or 25 years, than the initial cost of their construction amounts to.

As to the money that we are spending abroad, Mr. President—and I am willing that some of it be spent—we have no assurance that it is making us any stronger to meet the great challenge that confronts us. I do know that when we build a power dam that will protect the valley below from floods which destroy crops, property, and industry in that valley, it is strengthening America. I know that when we build such a project and it produces 100,000 kilowatts of electricity, it is making America stronger. I know it is adding to our capital assets and to our wealth, but I do not know that the \$2,197,000,000 it is proposed we spend abroad for economic aid to other countries this year will make America one ounce stronger economically or militarily. I do know that when we spend the money here, it will make us stronger. If we spend abroad what is proposed, \$2,197,000,000, and if we spend here only what is proposed in this bill and what we have already appropriated for reclamation, a total of \$866,000,000 here at home, we shall have spent only 39 percent of what it is proposed we give away this year to foreign countries. In other words, Mr. President, we are spending more than \$2.50 to build projects of this character in foreign countries, to make them economically stronger, for every dollar we are spending at home to make America stronger by developing those natural resources that give us greater economic strength and power. So, Mr. President, we could go on. I do not have the exact figures, but based upon past appropriations we could take into account rivers and harbors and flood control; we could take into account reclamation, to which I have already referred; we could add to that soil conservation, forest preservation, Federal aid for roads. We could add them all together and they would all total less than 2 cents out of each dollar we spend.

Mr. President, we are talking about economy. I too want to economize. I do not want to resort to false economy in order to make a little showing on paper. I know the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee who are present will recall that as for my own State I wanted to stay within the budget—and we have stayed within the budget. On one project that is in the course of construction I urged that we try to go along with the House figures, and cut nearly \$1,000,000 from the budget estimate. It was at the insistence of the Corps of Engineers that we finally restored the amount, because they said that an economic loss would result to the Government if the amount were not restored, in view of the contracts that had been let for the work to be done.

Mr. President, we have tried to economize. The attitude prevailed on the part of every member of the subcommittee as it went through the appropriation bill and during the course of the hearings of trying to find every place possible where we could economize, and

economize without economic loss. Where anything could reasonably and properly be deferred we undertook to defer it. There are projects that ought not, however, be deferred. We hear it said, "Since the big flood occurred in Kansas, since the great disaster which came to that State"—and it was one of the greatest disasters in the history of the Country, Mr. President—"we should get busy and start building some projects in Kansas." I agree with that. There are, however, a dozen other places in the Nation today where similar disasters could occur by reason of the fact that we are moving so slowly with the program of developing our water resources and building those protective projects that serve to save life and prevent tremendous loss of property.

Mr. President, I just wonder how much the great disaster in Kansas and Missouri has cost the Federal Government? We have already appropriated some \$25,000,000 for relief. The Government owned a warehouse in the flooded area in which it had stored \$5,000,000 worth of property. That warehouse and its contents were completely destroyed. The facilities that were destroyed there, for which the Government had already invested its money, have to be replaced, and the cost of replacement will run into other millions of dollars.

Then, Mr. President, we must take into consideration that practically every dollar's worth of property destroyed and lost in that flood will be deductible on income-tax returns.

Mr. President, the Federal Government this year, in that one flood, has lost half of what it would have cost in Federal expenditures to have prevented the loss. Of course that does not take into account the rich topsoil that is gone forever.

There will be found in this bill an appropriation of \$4,100,000 for bank stabilization on the Arkansas River. That item came in as a late budget request. The case for the item was made so strong that even the Bureau of the Budget, after it had twice turned the request down, after additional testimony had been developed before the committee, with a representative of the Bureau of the Budget present, and after he had been urged to go back and have the Bureau of the Budget reconsider the matter, returned to the committee with a budget request for the item.

I may say, Mr. President, that I can defend before any jury or bar of economists every project that is in the appropriation bill for my State. There are many other projects that are needed and await construction. But I can say that if the money asked for is not expended for river bank stabilization in Arkansas at the points for which it is allocated and directed by the bill to be spent, a tragedy could occur, and occur soon, not to the same extent possibly that it has in the more populated areas of Missouri and Kansas where the most recent tragedy struck, but a tragedy comparable thereto can easily occur in the city of Fort Smith, Ark., where the Arkansas River, just over the Oklahoma line, is threatening to cut across to the

Poteau River. Only one-half mile separates the two streams now. The Arkansas River has already cut several miles toward the Poteau River and only a half a mile strip of land is left there between them. Disaster will be the price we shall surely pay for neglect. The bill carries funds to prevent such a disaster. I do not believe any Senator on the floor, knowing the truth about the matter, knowing the facts about the situation, would dare say that that money should be eliminated from the bill.

There are several other danger spots that require immediate attention along the Arkansas. We are appropriating for eight of them in this bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. What the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of civil functions, just said is absolutely true. It is fortunate that in the last series of hearings before the committee a strong showing was made, sufficiently strong to impress the Bureau of the Budget not only of the need for the appropriation to be made for the project in the Senator's State where it is so badly needed, but also for projects in other States.

In view of the fact that this year record floods have wrought greater devastation than ever before, I will ask the Senator from Arkansas if it is not true that it might be false economy of the worst sort for us to neglect to retain the flood control items in the bills in order that flood controls projects may be properly implemented to prevent a recurrence of the very thing the Senator is talking about in his State, something of which we have had so tragic an experience in the States of Kansas and Missouri?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator from Kansas. We would be failing in our duty and our responsibility to the American people and to the Government if we did not carry on at least a modest construction program of this character. And this is a modest program compared to need. Those who want to call it pork barreling can do so. I have heard that expression until I have begun to like it, because the truth about it is that the reflection is not on those who are charged with pork barreling, but if there is any reflection at all it is in the other direction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I headed a committee of Senators who visited the flood areas in Missouri and Kansas some 2 weeks ago. Speaking of pork as such, I will say—and the Senator from Kansas can verify my statement—that in the stockyards of Kansas City, Kans., there were 50,000 tons of pork, actual pork, in carload lots—not one carload or three carloads, but hundreds of carloads—pork which had already been processed and on the way to market which the flood scattered all over the stockyards of

Kansas City, Kans., and destroyed. That was real pork.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is very well to have a pork barrel if we have pork in it. It is nice to have some pork. But we will have an empty barrel if we fail to do what is necessary to prevent such flood disasters as have been experienced this year. The floods have washed away much of our topsoil. The floods have come in torrent's down the valleys, destroying life and property. The floods empty the barrel.

I maintain that every one of these projects is actually self-liquidating. When we construct projects which are self-liquidating, as certain communities or valleys are protected greater investments are made in them, more wealth is produced, and greater revenue comes into the Treasury. While it is an indirect process, every one of these projects is actually self-liquidating.

Someone sent me in a letter a few days ago what are said to be excerpts from a speech by Mayor William B. Hartsfield, to the Upper Chattahoochee Development Association, at Gainesville, Ga., on June 17, 1951. I should like to read these excerpts into the RECORD:

As always, when river and water power developments come before Congress, the ugly term of "pork barrel" appears in the public prints. This term, according to the Dictionary of American English was first used in 1801 to designate barrels of salt pork kept in pioneer general stores in the New England States. In 1879 the term appeared in congressional debate likening Federal appropriations for post offices and local improvements to the local pork barrels in which everybody participated. The term "pork barrel" is now designated by the Dictionary of American English as "Federal appropriations made for local improvements designed to ingratiate Congressmen with their constituents."

Further tracing of this uncomplimentary and opprobrious term as applied, for some reason, solely to Federal waterway and water power developments, develops the fact that it was often used by the reactionary papers of the Northeast, largely dominated by great railroad and power trusts who, in the past, did not want to see the people develop their own natural resources. The fastening of this ugly name to the development of the Nation's natural resources was a stroke of genius on the part of those enemies of the people in those days who saw in the term "pork barrel" a way to inflame the people against the development of their own resources.

He concludes by expressing his own opinion. He says:

We, too, advocate economy in Government and an end to unnecessary waste, but let us not end the development of our own national wealth of soil and water, under the false and misleading slander of pork-barrel appropriations.

Mr. President, I have talked longer than I intended. I had in mind at the outset discussing some of the projects in my State. I shall do so in one general statement. There is not a project in the bill for the State of Arkansas for which I would not vote or which I would not support had it been in any other State. This is not a sectional matter. I am ready to defend those projects, as I am ready to defend others in the bill, against any assault which may be made against them. I know that they are meritorious.

I know that the Government has an obligation with respect to some of them. I know that to defer them would be unwise. I know that when they are constructed they are going to serve to strengthen our national economy. Their cost is small, while the need is great; and, notwithstanding the pressure for economy, in my humble judgment, it could easily be false economy from which our Government and our people would sustain substantial losses if those projects were not constructed and this money were not expended for the development of the protective works which are needed.

EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF TELEVISION

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, on May 31 the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and I introduced a bill (S. 1579) to establish a National Citizens' Advisory Board on Radio and Television. A few days later we introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) relating to television frequency assignments, construction of new stations, and television programming.

In the weeks that have elapsed since then two things have happened which affect these measures. One of them, the less important of the two, is that the sponsors have learned more about the complex problems of the revolution that is taking place in the field of broadcasting. The other is the fact that the urgency of the problems and opportunities created by this revolution has become even more apparent; this is television's summer of decision.

As a consequence, the four sponsors of the bill and resolution have revised and modified the language of these measures, and I herewith submit them on behalf of the other three sponsors and myself in their new form. We ask that the Interstate Commerce Committee regard them as substitutes for our earlier drafts.

The joint resolution is modified in one important particular, by the removal of section 1. Section 1 called for an extension of the existing freeze on the award of new television station licenses for a period of from 6 months to 1 year in order to assure more time for exploration by parties whose interest in television would serve the public good, and in order to guard against decisions by default. The chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Coy, has pointed out that even under existing procedures it is unlikely that any new stations will be on the air before Labor Day of 1952. He made the statement about a month ago in a hearing which was presided over by our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

A further extension of the freeze would create the risk that no new stations could go on the air before 1953. In view of the fact that a third of the Nation's population now gets no home television service at all, and a substantial proportion of the rest gets only one choice, or perhaps two choices of programs; and in view of the mounting public pressure for more even if not better

service—we have withdrawn our request for extension of the freeze. The remainder of the resolution stands as before.

Second, the bill to create a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television has undergone a number of textual modifications. All of these revisions are directed toward a single end: to make it even more clear that the proposed citizens advisory board is advisory only, and further to make it clear that the board's functions do not conflict with or in any way supersede the statutory powers vested by the Congress in the Federal Communications Commission.

With these changes, I have much more than a hope that the resolution and the bill will be acceptable to the members of the FCC. In fact we have had drafting assistance from an able counsel who was until recently a prominent member of the FCC staff. He tells me that the proposed board can do an important job which the FCC never has undertaken and never could undertake in view of the pressures on it. Mr. Wayne Coy, the able chairman of the FCC, has personally approved the new draft of the bill, though he makes it clear that he does not speak for other members of the Commission.

Mr. President, the sponsors of this bill and this resolution believe that television opens for the American people the widest avenue to popular enlightenment the world has yet seen. Within the coming weeks and months, and over the next year or two, the basic pattern of TV will be set for decades to come. Will TV become an avenue to popular enlightenment or an Atlantic City boardwalk? The Congress cannot avoid or deny all responsibility for this choice. The most articulate pressures on the Congress came from those who, on their past record, are likely to lead us on the road to trivialization. There is no listener or viewers lobby in Washington to exert any counterpressure against trivialization.

The proposed National Citizens Advisory Board, as this bill envisages it, would be composed of 11 outstanding private citizens, drawn from the fields of education and communications and from among leaders in the civic, cultural, and religious life of the Nation, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In an annual report to Congress, to the Federal Communications Commission and to the public, the Board would review how radio and television are serving the public interest, or are failing to serve it. This annual report would point up broadcasting's successes and failures. Most importantly, it would suggest how radio and TV could learn better to serve the public interest.

The power to grant and withhold licenses must of course remain untrammelled in the Federal Communications Commission. However, the FCC has neither the time nor the authority actively to seek out, or to help marshal or crystallize public opinion. Nor does it claim to have competence in education. During its existence it has brought out only one general critique of broadcasting, the famed Blue Book of 1946, which, though it was mild enough, stirred up great controversy.

Some argued that the bluebook was a step which could lead ultimately toward

the censorship and control by a Government agency of the substance of what is broadcast in the United States. Nobody wants censorship in the United States—including the members of the FCC—but the charges, though they were denied, illustrate the problems of a Government regulatory agency whose duties infringe in any way on the field of information. The bluebook had some good results—but they soon faded away.

Because it would be advisory only, the proposed Citizens Advisory Board would not be subject to the charge of "censorship." Yet its potency should not be underestimated. The broadcasting industry, for all the fact that it has no radio and TV consumers lobby to contend with in Washington, and has the field to itself, cannot and will not be insensitive either to praise or constructive criticism over the long pull, and to the force of articulate public opinion.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to clear up one misunderstanding. In my earlier remarks on the floor on this subject I have hailed the action of the regents of the University of the State of New York in asking the FCC for licenses to build a network of 11 educational TV stations in that State, as one of the most dramatic evidences of what we can hope will be a trend—a trend which could open up television for the great uses of education. The broadcasting trade press has since reported that the New York regents have reduced their request from 11 stations to 3. Mr. Henry C. Fischer, counsel for the New York regents, has now written me that the press reports are untrue, and that the regents are going ahead with their plans for the full 11 stations. I again point out that under the tentative FCC allocation table only eight stations are reserved for education in the State of New York; only one is set aside for Connecticut and one for Massachusetts; and New Jersey is to get none. I use these merely as examples.

In conclusion I should like to read three or four sentences from this remarkable letter from Mr. Fischer. He points out that—

The (New York) Board of Regents is a constitutional body charged by law with the general management and supervision of all the educational work of the State, public and private, and its plan to use television in education was devised pursuant to its statutory duty to extend to the people at large increased educational opportunities and facilities and to stimulate interest therein.

Mr. President, the New York Board of Regents, according to Mr. Fischer, "has funds invested in the physical plant of the system for which it is responsible in excess of \$2,000,000,000. In the year ending June 30 approximately \$550,000,000 was spent under the direction of this board by the public school system of New York State alone, exclusive of construction funds received from bond sales and certificates of indebtedness."

Mr. President, only 6 States in the United States and only one city—New York City—have budgets greater than the sum which was spent by the New York Board of Regents for public education in New York State. I emphasize

these figures because of the repeated charges of the commercial interests in the field of television that there is no money for educational television and educational broadcasting. There is the money, when and if the understanding of the need and the opportunity develops. The New York Board of Regents has made a study of costs of construction and operation. Mr. Fischer states in his letter that—

Without anticipating the detailed information which will be supplied to the Commission, it can be stated that the cost of the physical plant of the proposed television network and its operation will be insignificant in relation to the investment in the educational system of the State and the annual cost of maintaining it.

Mr. President, it was Mr. Jacob F. Holtzmann, the chairman of the subcommittee of the New York Board of Regents which investigated television, who announced at the completion of the study that the unallocated TV frequencies are the American people's most important national asset. Further he stated that the New York Board of Regents asserted that "we have a first mortgage upon them."

Again I pay tribute to the leadership of the 13 distinguished citizens who constitute this board, as they demonstrate their leadership in their great State of New York. With time and the power of their example, I hope other States throughout the Nation will make up their minds to go and do likewise.

I now ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fischer's full letter be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCHER, WILLIS & PANZER,
Washington, D. C., August 6, 1951.
HON. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENTON: I have noted a good deal of confusion and misunderstanding in the press and in interested circles about the plan of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York to establish a television network as an integral part of the educational system of the State. Because of the interest you have shown in the plan, it may be helpful for me, as special counsel to the board of regents in connection with the matter, to outline the present status of its proposed educational television network, and in this fashion dissipate some of the confusion about it.

As you know, the Federal Communications Commission has tentatively reserved eight television channels in the State of New York exclusively for noncommercial educational use, located one each in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Albany, Ithaca, Binghamton, and New York City. In the location of these reserved channels, the Commission used admirable judgment, and the board of regents fully supports the Commission in this respect.

On the other hand, the board of regents has determined after study and will demonstrate to the Commission in the course of the current hearings that an educational television network adequate to tap properly the educational programming sources and to provide the benefits of educational television equitably throughout the State will require three additional channels, one each in Poughkeepsie and in the north country, and a second channel in the New York City metropolitan

area and, further, that it is feasibly within the framework of the Commission's allocation plan to provide these additional outlets. The 11 channels involved in the plan of the board of regents have been conservatively estimated to include within their coverage areas over 90 percent of the population of the State—almost 13,500,000 people.

Some of the current confusion about the plan of the board of regents stems from a recent report in Broadcasting magazine that the plan had been scaled down to involve only three channels. This report is unfortunately erroneous. The proposal of the board of regents contemplates the full use of 11 television channels and the case which will be presented to the Commission in detail will be in support of this proposal.

Some additional confusion about the plan of the board of regents seems to stem from a general lack of understanding of the unique character of the educational system of the State and the position of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York in relation to all public and private educational institutions in the State, ranging from kindergartens through universities, postgraduate schools, museums, and libraries. The board of regents is a constitutional body charged by law with the general management and supervision of all the educational work of the State, public, and private, and its plan to use television in education was devised pursuant to its statutory duty "to extend to the people at large increased educational opportunities and facilities" and "to stimulate interest therein." The board consists of 13 members; one regent is elected each year for a term of 13 years by a ballot of the two houses of the legislature meeting in joint session. Membership is honorary; members receive no compensation other than traveling expenses. The board manages the affairs of higher education in the State through the University of the State of New York. Every public and private organization of higher education, library, and museum in the State is by statute an institution of the University of the State of New York. The board manages the affairs of the public schools and all other educational work of the State through the State education department, of which it is the statutory head. The president of the University of the State of New York and the commissioner of education, Dr. Lewis A. Wilson, is the executive officer of the board of regents, is appointed by it and serves at its pleasure. The chancellor of the board of regents is John P. Myers; the special committee on television in education consists of Regent Jacob L. Holtzmann, chairman, Regent Roger W. Straus, and Vice Chancellor Edward R. Eastman.

The system of public and private education within the jurisdiction and subject to the general supervision of the board of regents in the year 1949-50 included 126 institutions of higher education with an enrollment of over 270,000, 1,189 secondary schools with an enrollment of over 615,000, 6,092 elementary schools with an enrollment of over 2,350,000, 640 libraries, 60 museums, and 140 historical societies. The funds invested in the physical plant of this system exceed \$2,000,000,000. In the year ending June 30, 1950, approximately \$550,000,000 was spent by the public-school system alone, exclusive of construction funds received from bond sales and certificates of indebtedness. In that year, the State aid for public schools amounted to approximately \$236,000,000, and the State aid for adult education amounted to about \$2,300,000.

In the light of the unique nature of this educational system, its scope, and the quality and independence of those charged with its management, much of the conjecture and confusion about the television plan of the board of regents, particularly in relation to costs and operation, is dissipated. A study

of costs of construction and operation has been made and without anticipating the detailed information which will be supplied to the Commission it can be stated that the cost of the physical plant of the proposed television network and its operation will be insignificant in relation to the investment in the education system of the State and the annual cost of maintaining it.

Further, the plan of the board of regents envisages that the programing of the television stations will be primarily the responsibility of the more than 8,000 educational institutions in the system which have almost unlimited resources for the development of worth-while educational programing designed to enrich the offerings in elementary and secondary schools, to expand adult education and to encourage the cultural interests of the people of the State. The plan envisages further the setting up of local councils made up of representatives of the colleges, universities, the private and public schools, the libraries and museums, and all other agencies that would be largely responsible for the planning of the local or area television programs, in order to insure the continuous development of programs to meet the educational needs of the area. The State education department will assist these area councils in planning State-wide programs, will arrange for kinescope recordings and motion-picture programs of interest to all sections of the State, will integrate programs to supplement the courses of study in the schools and will provide a staff to advise with and serve the local councils in the coordination of the programing of all the stations. Dr. Wilson has already held extensive conferences throughout the State with representatives of public and private educational institutions looking toward the organization of the local programing councils under the plan. The support indicated at these conferences and the general support of the press throughout the State has been gratifying.

I will be glad to give you any additional information about the matter that will be helpful to you in eliminating doubt as to the status of the plan of the board of regents.

Very truly yours,

HENRY G. FISCHER.

REPLY TO SENATOR MCCARTHY

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I should like to read a statement issued to the press last week by one of our colleagues in the Senate. I know about rule XIX, and have had personal experience with it, but I submit that it does not cover the remarks a Senator makes about himself. The remarks I am about to make apply directly to myself because they were made about me.

Mr. President, the following statement was issued to the press last Monday, a week ago today, by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]:

I am sure that Owen Lattimore and all the Alger Hisses and William Remingtons still in Government will agree with BENTON's resolution. Tonight BENTON has established himself as the hero of every Communist and crook in and out of Government.

BENTON today has performed the important service of helping the people label the administration branch of the Democratic Party as the party which stands for Government of, by, and for communism, crooks, and cronies.

I call the attention of all honest loyal Democrats to how men of little minds are destroying the once great party.

While BENTON was Assistant Secretary of State, he worked hand in glove with the Communist clique who have been so bad for America and so good for Communist Rus-

sia. The exact number that he personally brought into Government is not fully known at this time. No wonder he squeals and screams in panic as the McCarran committee starts to uncover some of them.

Lucky for this country that Connecticut's mental midget doesn't run the Senate. BENTON will learn that people of Connecticut do not like communism and crooks in Government any more than the people of Maryland like them.

The campaign in Maryland exposes the whitewash of Communists in Government. If that was wrong, then the district attorney and not the criminal should be blamed whenever the district attorney exposes graft, corruption, and dishonesty.

Mr. President, I shall not now directly comment on this statement, as such. I refused comment at the time. I expect to continue to refuse it.

Last week, on a television program, the junior Senator from Wisconsin was asked whether he intended to go into the political campaigns in other States than his own during next year's elections, and specifically whether he intended to go into Connecticut. He replied that he would go into any State where he thought he could do good. I herewith invite him to come into Connecticut again, as he did three times last fall during the campaign. The people of my State know right from wrong. They are politically literate. Further, they have strong stomachs.

Last fall the junior Senator from Wisconsin divorced himself from Maryland long enough to come into New Haven, Hartford, and Bridgeport. On those three trips he denounced my senior colleague and myself. I may say that I attribute my own victory in part to his visits to Connecticut.

When his appearance was announced for New Haven, I called on the people of New Haven to boycott the meeting and to stay away from the hall, which seats 6,000 persons. To the everlasting credit of the people of New Haven only 376 people showed up to listen to him. Furthermore, as I jestingly told the people of Connecticut the next day, 100 of those 376 people were good Democrats—I claimed they were my Democratic spies—so, I contended, that left a net audience of only 276.

By the time the junior Senator from Wisconsin got to Bridgeport, he was in a room not much larger than the corner of the Senate floor, and his audience totaled only 200 persons. I think it may interest those who have not attended these meetings to know how they are conducted. I sent my four children to that meeting, and they took six of their friends. They described the meeting in detail on their return home. Of course, I was glad to tell the State that I had privately and personally contributed 5 percent of that particular audience.

These meetings open with a couple of Marines in full uniform and with the playing of the Marine song, "The Halls of Montezuma," while the audience stands at attention. Then the audience is called upon to repeat in unison the oath of allegiance to the flag. It is against that kind of background that these meetings are held.

Mr. President, I won by only 1,102 votes, and I again suggest that it may

well be that the presence in Connecticut of the junior Senator from Wisconsin was the decisive factor.

At this point I should like to read a paragraph from an editorial appearing in last Wednesday's issue of the Hartford Courant, a staunchly Republican newspaper:

Senator McCARTHY's reply to the Benton resolution was typical. It ignored completely its factual basis, and sought to smother it in a smokescreen of name-calling. The Senate subcommittee that investigated the Maryland campaign as a byproduct indicted Senator McCARTHY for—

Mr. President, I now omit the next two lines of the editorial, in order to make sure that I am not interrupted by being called to order. I shall place the responsibility for those words wholly on the Hartford Courant, and anyone who is interested can readily look up the editorial.

The editorial then continues as follows:

Republicans on the subcommittee joined their Democratic colleagues in condemning this. But not one word about their unanimous report appears in Senator McCARTHY's reply—perhaps because there was nothing he could say in defense of what he had done. Instead he sought to distract attention by calling Senator BENTON "Connecticut's mental midget," adding that he had "established himself as the hero of every Communist and crook in and out of Government."

Mr. President, now I should like to read a paragraph from an editorial appearing in the Sunday issue of the Bridgeport Herald. I read these editorials in order further to show not only how the people of my State reacted during the election campaign last fall, but also how they react right now.

Mr. President, I hope these two illustrations may give some of my colleagues greater courage in facing up to this issue, which is one of the most important issues of our time. The Bridgeport Herald said:

The effect of our Senator WILLIAM BENTON's demand that Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY resign or be expelled from the Senate, is to bring to public attention a report on "Red-eye" Joe's activities that might otherwise have gone unnoticed.

Had not BENTON cited the report by an investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Rules, few would have become aware that McCARTHY was sharply censured for his part in winning the 1950 senatorial election in Maryland for newcomer JOHN M. BUTLER."

These are the first two Connecticut editorials I have seen regarding my resolution calling for the expulsion of the junior Senator from Wisconsin from the Senate. I submit the full text for the RECORD, subject to such deletions as those who edit the RECORD think may be suitable in line with the rules which prevail in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of August 8, 1951]

THE CURE FOR MCCARTHYISM

As noted elsewhere in these columns today, Senator BENTON is way off base in wanting to liquidate football at West Point and Annapolis. But he was right on base in his

proposal, made the same day, that Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, resign or be investigated with a view to expelling him from the Senate.

As Senator BENTON remarked, there is little in Senator McCARTHY's record to indicate he will resign. And this despite formal disclosure of his part in the dirty work in the 1950 Butler-Tydings campaign in Maryland. Nor, unhappily, is there much in the long history of the Senate to arouse hope that Senator McCARTHY will even be investigated, let alone expelled. Most likely Senator BENTON's resolution will just gather dust in the files of the Rules Committee. But that does not change the fact that political life in this country would be healthier were Mr. McCARTHY to leave it. The moral swamp on the administration side in Washington is smelly enough, without the different but equally unclean political morals of Wisconsin's junior Senator on the Republican side.

Senator McCARTHY's reply to the Benton resolution was typical. It ignored completely its factual basis, and sought to smother it in a smokescreen of name calling. The Senate subcommittee that investigated the Maryland campaign as a byproduct indicted Senator McCARTHY for his dirty work, which included plain lying through a deliberately faked photograph. Republicans on the subcommittee joined their Democratic colleagues in condemning this. But not one word about their unanimous report appears in Senator McCARTHY's reply—perhaps because there was nothing he could say in defense of what he had done. Instead he sought to distract attention by calling Senator BENTON "Connecticut's mental midget," adding that he had "established himself as a hero of every Communist and crook in and out of Government."

This is remarkably similar to a Soviet propaganda technique, as happened to be demonstrated on the same day. A month ago President Truman sent to Nikolai Shvernik, nominal head of the Soviet Union, the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution of friendship for the Russian people, asking that it be passed on to them. Not until Monday did Moscow reply. And only thereafter were the American statements published—together with a phony peace proposal, hatched in secret in the Kremlin to smother what this country had to say to the Russian people.

There does remain one slow but sure way to take care of Senator McCARTHY. The remedy lies in the hands of Wisconsin's people, who sent him to the Senate in 1946 before he had demonstrated his habit of mixing falsehood with truth and passing them off as one and the same thing. When he runs for reelection in the fall of 1952, they can return him to the obscurity whence he came.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Herald]

BENTON VERSUS MCCARTHY

The effect of our Senator WILLIAM BENTON's demand that Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY resign or be expelled from the Senate, is to bring to public attention a report on "Red-eye" Joe's activities that might otherwise have gone unnoticed.

Had not BENTON cited the report by an investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Rules, few would have become aware that McCARTHY was sharply censured for his part in winning the 1950 senatorial election in Maryland for newcomer JOHN M. BUTLER.

Without the Connecticut Senator's action, the subcommittee's report might well have been kicked around until it got lost. It has not yet been accepted either by the full committee, of which Senator BENTON is a member, or by the Senate.

A full investigation of McCARTHY and the smears and sneers he uses in his capacity as GOP hatchet man, has long been overdue. He should not be allowed to use the protec-

tion of Senatorial immunity to slander, abuse, and vilify.

Senator BENTON got only a modified McCARTHY treatment during last fall's campaign. He now has laid himself open to the works.

But somebody had to boldly initiate the distasteful job of putting McCARTHY in his place, which is certainly not in the United States Senate. We are glad that Senator BENTON started it, and hope the rest of the Senate has the courage to finish it.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I think the Senate will be interested in my mail on this resolution of mine. Last year, when I took the floor in my distress over the reckless charges of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, in my first speech on the floor of the Senate, I said that, whether he realized it or not, consciously or unconsciously, he adopted and followed the techniques of the Soviet propagandists, with which I am so familiar; because I was responsible for studying them. Yes, I devoted almost 3 years to studying the terrifying tactics and techniques of the Soviet propagandists. In that first speech of almost 18 months ago, I used the phrase "hit and run propagandist," and suggested that, whether he knew it or not, the junior Senator from Wisconsin was a "hit and run propagandist" of the Soviet type. I pointed out that he hits and he runs, and he does not answer, he does not face up to the charges.

Mr. President, from this statement, he issued about me you would think the Maryland report was written about me. You would think that it was I who was the central figure in the indictment in the Maryland report.

My mail at the time of this first speech ran 8, 9 or 10 to 1 critical of my statements about the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Today my mail is running very very differently. I have received roughly 400 letters of congratulations, the most laudatory letters I have ever received in my 51 years of life; and I do not deserve them. I may say, even though I welcome them and thank these 400 people who have written me such enthusiastic letters. I have only received 270 letters of censure, many of them unsigned, including scores of postcards bearing no signature—crank letters, the kind of letters with which all of us are familiar. Of this 270, almost 100 are unsigned postcards. I have even had the unique experience, for me at least, of receiving an unsolicited contribution, in one of the letters, a \$5 bill.

Mr. President, I submit this brief report today as a follow up on the resolution which I submitted to the Senate a week ago today, and as a preliminary to the report which this body will receive from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I think, within the next week. The committee, last Wednesday, voted to submit the report of the subcommittee on the Maryland campaign after a 10-day delay.

AMERICA'S HOUR OF DECISION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the future of America is today being debated throughout the land. The question is whether we shall have substantially more military power than the programs now planned for this fiscal year. The

fate of the Nation may well rest upon the wisdom of our decision, and it is not an easy decision. On the one hand, we have to guard against a growing inflation in our country, and on the other hand, to build military power that can surely protect us against a growing threat to our existence.

Hearings in the subcommittee on the Armed Services of the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, have not yet been completed on the military appropriations proposed for the current fiscal year. Yet we have valid data which show that the Russians may outstrip our military power unless we increase our efforts. Meanwhile, the cost of our Armed Forces, already great, is increasing every day.

There is no question about the value and necessity for all the armed services in any war we may have to fight, but there is also no escaping the fact that air power is the challenging problem. Russian armies, as serious a threat as they may be to our allies and to world peace, are a long distance from our shores, and the main capability of our allies is to produce ground power. The Russian Navy can scarcely be considered a major threat against us, because the United States Navy is roughly as large as the combined fleets of the rest of the world—including our allies. It is not open to argument that the Russian Army or the Russian Navy could not by any surprise attack stop or greatly delay the slow but sure build-up of our military forces.

But the Russian Air Force could do all of these things. It is only a few hours away, no matter what we do, and armed with the atomic bombs the Russians possess, could do us terrible damage in a few hours. It could take the lives of many thousands of our citizens, and it could disrupt our whole armament program. It may be able to do these things despite the best we can do in the way of air defense during the next few years.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator made the statement that the Russian Air Force using atomic missiles, might take the lives of many thousands of our citizens. I am sure the Senator realizes they might take the lives of untold millions of our citizens.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, it seems entirely probable to the junior Senator from Louisiana that the losses in one or two days conceivably could be more than we have lost in an entire world war.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct.

It is simply beyond human comprehension to foretell the number of American people who might be killed, and the damage which might be wrought in this country, if the Russians made up their

minds to proceed with a surprise attack, and, as we might express it in common parlance, to throw at us everything they possessed in the way of air power. I wish to thank the Senator for his contribution.

Our Air Force can not promise to halt fully a determined Russian air attack, and certainly our Army and Navy, brave as they are, can do little to protect us from a growing number of long-range Russian planes and atomic bombs. Neither can our Army and Navy strike back effectively or readily against the sources of Russian power deep within the land mass of Eurasia.

Fortunately for us, we now have superiority in the weapon which threatens us most. We have reason to believe that our superiority in atomic bombs will enable us to strike a counter-blow that would more than offset any surprise atomic attack against us. The evidence indicates that this fact, and our potential enemy's knowledge of it, has saved the world from a major war up to now.

But every month our margin of superiority in long-range air power decreases, as Russian air strength is relentlessly built up. If this trend continues, there is great danger that, like the dictators of the past, Stalin will move to exploit Russian air superiority and will attack us in the belief that he can overwhelm us in the air by combining force and surprise. Already there is evidence that the Russian despots are beginning to believe in their ability to destroy us in the air. They have emphasized their air build-up for several years and they have achieved almost incredible progress.

Even if they should be overoptimistic and mistaken about the quality of their superior numbers of pilots and aircraft, the greatest tragedy of history might result from their mistake. We want our ability to retaliate to be so demonstrable and unmistakable that it will not be challenged.

Whatever may be the size or composition of the force we need to do this, there is no denying that we must have it, and to me it is only logical that the size of our forces must bear a direct relationship to the size of the Russian forces. Most certainly it is not a partisan question and it must not become a partisan matter. I have been emphasizing the importance of air power for many years, and I have never considered my efforts as a party issue. I have been supported by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the chairman of the subcommittee, which includes the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who just made a fine contribution in connection with my remarks, and also some distinguished members of the Republican Party. Emphatically, this is not a matter of inter-service jealousy, and it must not be decided on the basis of service prestige.

It is because I deplore any tendency to twist the question "What constitutes adequate air power?" into a party battle or a service battle that I desire to invite attention to an article in the New York Times of July 29 by Mr. Hanson Baldwin, and ask that the article be printed in

the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Mr. Baldwin is a graduate of Annapolis and a well-known commentator on military matters.

The balanced-force theory about which he writes fails to take into account the known strengths and weaknesses of our potential enemy, and this failure will surely result in our being overly strong in some departments and weak in others. We are faced by a reasonably well known situation today, one for which we can prepare. Wars have been won by armies in past history, and wars have been won by navies in the past, as well as by both those services combined. There is no reason to assume that a war cannot be won by air power, and if war is forced upon us by Russia, under present circumstances and conditions, that is the way we will have to win it. We certainly can not sail a navy into Russia nor can we march an army there.

Korea has demonstrated the decisiveness of air power, as well as its limitations. Despite the fact that our airmen were not permitted to attack some of the prime targets of airpower—the sources of the supplies and equipment used in that war and the points where most of the soldiers were mobilized, trained and equipped—it has been proved that our land-based and sea-based air power largely compensated for inferiority in numbers of men on the ground. To condemn a weapon as limited because its full use was prohibited is not logical.

Neither the Korean war, nor any other war, has tested the merits of intercontinental bombing, and it is opinion—not argument—to say that the concept is fallacious. The B-36, which has never been bought in great numbers although it has proved its intercontinental capabilities many times, is not a failure. Like all airplanes which have been in existence for several years, it can now be superseded by faster and more effective bombers designed to do the same job.

It is entirely possible that Russian strength, naval, ground and air, has been exaggerated in the press. The figures, however, which have been quoted are derived from many intelligence agencies, including those of other Nations. They present a very sobering picture. Arguments that we are concealing our own air strength, or hiding a number of groups somewhere, serve only to mislead and confuse.

It is true, as Mr. Baldwin says, that we must consider the effect on our economy of any substantial increase in our air power. I will add that we must consider not only the effect of our air power on our economy, but of our presently balanced—rather equalized—investment in the Army and Navy. And we must put first things first.

As I see the picture, Mr. President, after many years of hearing testimony before various committees, the first thing at this moment, under present circumstances, is air power.

EXHIBIT 1

HOW BIG AN AIR FORCE—ARGUMENT IS RE-OPENED—CASE FOR AND AGAINST THE 150-GROUP PROGRAM WEIGHED BY THE PENTAGON (By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Air power, newest of the military arms, became again last week the center of controversy in Washington as a major expansion of the Air Force was projected.

Two speeches—one by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts, the other by Earle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, describing the United States as a "second rate air power" and urging an expansion of the Air Force by considerably more than 50 percent—have been accompanied by a spate of articles and statements urging similar expansion.

Both President Truman and Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, following the opening of what some observers believed was a planned campaign for air expansion, declared that an increase in the military budget was being studied but that studies of costs—and of purposes for which more dollars would be requested—would not be completed until the fall.

The proposals for Air Force expansion are becoming a highly controversial interservice issue, and also may become a political and economic issue. For the suggested increases imply priority for the Air Force in dollars and manpower at the expense of the balanced-forces principle and also imply concentration upon the strategy of victory through air power, which the Army and Navy reject. Factors of service prestige are also important.

ECONOMIC QUESTION

So far, the economic issue involved in the Air Force expansion program is secondary; indeed, no such issue may really develop if the dimensions of the program are plainly within financial reach without too great an increase in taxes, or without injury to the economic well-being of the Nation. But the early arguments in favor of the Air Force expansion program advocated the ending of the "guns-and-butter" period of military expansion, the elimination of the butter and an increase in the guns. Such an economic philosophy might also have obvious political overtones with a presidential election in the offing.

These then are the potential dimensions of a controversy which has not, as yet, been accurately defined, largely because nearly all of the expansion proposals so far published have been unofficial and the administration has not committed itself. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been studying the issue intermittently and between now and November they must formulate military-budget requests for the 1953 fiscal year.

The expansion proposals, insofar as they can now be defined, envisage an Air Force of from about 138 to 150 combat groups, which would number from 18 to 75 planes each (with the men to fly and maintain them). Today, the Air Force is expanding toward a 95-group goal, 15 of which, Senator Lodge claimed (but others dispute), are air transport and troop-carrier groups.

National Guard and Reserve air groups prior to Korea totaled 61 additional air groups, but 14 of these had been ordered into Federal service by last February, and 33 others were then scheduled for call. The present program, which was to reach its 95-group goal next July 1, is only partly completed; the approximate strength of the Air Force today is given as about 87 groups as compared to 59 incomplete groups on December 1, 1948.

BUDGET MATTERS

The cost of this 150-group Air Force by Senator Lodge's calculations, which are disputed by the Pentagon, would be \$10,000,-

000,000 more than has actually been requested for the Air Force for the current fiscal year, and a total cost of \$96,000,000,000 for the Air Force for 3 years. The expansion of manpower would involve an increase from the present 737,000 officers and men in the Air Force beyond the 95-group goal of 1,061,000 (to be reached by July 1, 1952) to an eventual 1,800,000.

The proposals being formulated in the Pentagon differ—in some respects widely—from Senator Lodge's proposals, and they have not yet been accurately "price-tagged." One plan suggested in official circles, however, is for a 138-combat-group Air Force (plus transport groups). Such an Air Force might imply a \$70,000,000,000 annual defense budget, with the big slice of the pie—perhaps \$40,000,000,000—going to the Air Force, and the remainder divided between an Army and Navy which would be strictly limited or perhaps even reduced in size.

These figures compare with a total military budget of about \$48,000,000,000 in the past fiscal year and more than \$60,000,000,000 requested for the current fiscal year. Of this latter total the Army and Air Force have requested appropriations of more than \$20,000,000,000 each, the Navy more than \$15,000,000,000, plus additional billions for each service for supplemental and military-works programs.

The new program would obviously involve, therefore, a major change in the percentage allotment of the defense dollar to the services, and might involve actual reductions in the size of the Army and Navy.

The principal arguments that are advanced for the projected program are:

1. Air power is the "point of the spear," as Senator Lodge put it. "No ground force can win against hostile tactical air superiority unless it is prepared to mass tremendous weight of numbers and accept fantastic casualties." Air power, in other words, is the most important arm in war today and could conceivably—with the aid of the atom bomb—achieve victory through air power without the utilization of tremendous land armies.

2. The ground forces being built up in Europe by General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower must have heavy tactical air support, a major portion of which must come from the United States. Without such air support there is no use raising the ground divisions.

SOVIET PRESSURE

3. Russian progress in atomic and long-range bomber development makes imperative a stronger United States air defense.

4. The weakness of the Convair B-36 program—with few of these intercontinental planes available—necessitates a sharp expansion of our strategic jet medium bombers, and the appropriation of funds to produce the Boeing B-52, a giant jet replacement for the B-36.

5. Obvious Russian progress in the air has pushed the United States into second place in certain types of airpower and threatens our lead in other types; in other words, we are being outstripped in the air-arms race.

The arguments against the proposals are:

1. No one service can win a war alone, and the proposed expansion program would end the "team" concept of "balanced forces" and would strengthen the Air Force at the expense of the other services to such an extent as to endanger our military effectiveness and our present strategic concepts. It would encourage an Air Force "go-it-alone" philosophy and emphasis on an "easy war" strategy, which is fundamentally fallacious, but, in an election year, politically appealing.

2. Korea has demonstrated the limitations of air power. Observers point to World War II—specifically to Rommel, inferior on the ground and in the air—and to Korea to refute Senator Lodge's assertion that ground

forces without air superiority cannot win. No mass air superiority will stop Russian divisions from overrunning Western Europe, unless United Nations ground divisions are available in sufficient strength.

FALSE CONCEPT

3. The intercontinental bombing concept is today fallacious and the bulk of Air Force funds should be put not into a big bomber program but into tactical air power and medium-speed bombers.

4. Russian air strength is being deliberately exaggerated in order to secure support for the proposed expansion program. Our own air strength is similarly being minimized; for instance, it is alleged the Air Force today actually has more than 100 groups, instead of 87, and the comparisons of United States and Russian air strength usually omit our naval aviation, strongest in the world.

5. Adding billions to the defense budget for an indefinite period might weaken our economy and play into Stalin's hands.

Some increase in Air Force strength seems likely, but the immediate goal will probably not be—unless world war III appears imminent—as large as the 150 groups urged by Senator Lodge.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 684) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952, and it was signed by the Vice President.

IMPRISONMENT OF ASSOCIATED PRESS CORRESPONDENT WILLIAM OATIS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have an article which I think is of sufficient importance to be read into the Record at this time. It is written by Ray Brock, special correspondent, now in Turkey, and reads as follows:

ISTANBUL, TURKEY.—Poor Bill Oatis is getting the full treatment from the brutal, cunning Russian MVD in the characteristic Communist methods of endless inquisitions, near-starvation, solitary confinement, drugs, beatings, and more inquisitions, under the blinding floodlights of the Soviet inquisitors.

I should have explained, Mr. President, that Mr. Brock has been a foreign correspondent a great many years. He covered the Spanish-American War and World War II in France and in the Balkans. He is now in Turkey covering some of the current events there. The letter continues:

While State Secretary Acheson evades and parries questions about the Associated Press chief in Prague—and while the White House and Congressmen issue pious, futile denunciations of the torture and imprisonment of an American newspaperman following his

Communist drumhead trial—William N. Oatis is undergoing literal hell in a four-by-four cell in Prague.

A Slovak underground agent, a former assistant military attaché in a nearby Balkan capital, slipped into Turkey with first-hand information on Oatis' confinement, his condition, and positive assurances that Oatis will be dead of malnutrition, shock, and sheer brutalization, unless he is sprung from his vile prison cell within a matter of weeks. The Soviet Press may then be expected to issue the usual communique that Oatis was killed while trying to escape or that he died of some vague disease.

Gunboat diplomacy is perhaps out of date; and even the British sat out the sentences and imprisonments of a group of British engineers who were hurled into the notorious Lubianka prison in Moscow in 1933 for alleged sabotage. But the case of William N. Oatis is an outrage meriting something more than the platitudes of Dean Gooderham Acheson. The impotence of the American State Department, the United States Congress, and the President, himself, to do anything—even to communicate with Oatis—is typical of the low prestige, influence, and power of the west in Central Europe, the Balkans, and Middle East today.

Bill Oatis has been sentenced to 10 years of the vilest imprisonment, with the attendant tortures, privations, inquisitions peculiar to Soviet methods, for having done nothing more than perform the routine duties of an American foreign correspondent. According to my Slovak informant, Oatis is being subjected to day and night, around the clock, inquisition. He is denied anything but a slim bread ration and gruel—enough to keep him, temporarily, alive—and is subjected to beatings, druggings, and sleepless hours of repetitious questioning designed to break his will, his morale, his health, and elicit the usual "confession" of espionage, sabotage, and acts against the Czech Communist Government and the Soviet Union.

This correspondent is personally familiar with the efforts and intervention of Secretary Acheson on behalf of another celebrated political prisoner—and, as far as I am concerned, I'd rather be dead. The previous prisoner was Gen. Draja Mihailovich, Commander in Chief of the Serbian Chetniks, who, callously abandoned by the OWI, the OSS, and the misinformed western press as an Axis "collaborationist," was run down, ultimately, by Tito's Communist partisans. Half dead of typhus, ravaged by the hunger and privation of his years of guerrilla warfare against the Germans, Italians, the Croatian Fascist Ustashi, Mihailovich was subjected to intolerable tortures, drugged, beaten to insensibility, revived, and tried before a Communist court in Belgrade. The Serbian general then confessed, almost inaudibly, to alleged "accommodation with"—Winston Churchill's phrase—the Axis enemy. Mihailovich was taken to the subbasement of a Belgrade prison and riddled with sub-machine-gun fire—riddled so as to make the body unrecognizable. Then the mangled corpse was tossed into a hidden grave to prevent Serb Loyalists from retrieving it for honorable burial.

Before and during the trial of Draja Mihailovich this correspondent headed a mission to Washington to intervene on the general's behalf with the State Department and the President. This mission included on its roster such responsible and liberal figures as Dorothy Thompson, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, international journalists of undisputed renown—Christopher Emmet, a recognized free-rights crusading journalist; David Martin, journalist, writer, and author of *Ally Betrayed*, a documented history of Mihailovich's campaign; and 37 United States wartime pilots, bombardiers, navigators, and gunners who had parachuted into

Mihailovich-held Yugoslav territory, had been saved, protected, and repatriated to the Allied lines. The fliers chartered a plane to Chicago, foregathered from their scattered home cities, and flew to Washington to join me. We approached the State Department and the White House for a hearing, with affidavits from all the fliers who, parachuting from disabled bombers into Mihailovich territory, had eye witnessed his campaign against the Axis enemy, and who had been flown out to Allied air bases in Italy from a clandestine field constructed by the Chetniks.

But the pro-Soviet influence was still in the ascendancy in official Washington in the early summer of 1946. Acting Secretary Acheson, counseled by Alger Hiss, flatly refused to see the fliers or any members of the Mihailovich mission. The worried President was advised by Hiss to give the American airmen the brush-off. He did so. This correspondent, at a Presidential press conference, was told that the President had turned the matter over to his military aide (General Vaughan) and that was as far as it would go. It went further, however.

Warned by the then near eastern desk chief of the State Department, Wallace Barbour, that the American airmen were preparing to make a public statement on the issue, Dean Acheson relented. He agreed to a 5-minute conference. The head of the fliers' delegation, David Martin, and I, stayed 45. We laid the affidavits before Acheson. We pointed out, with documents and unimpeachable proof, that Mihailovich stood in peril of political murder for nothing more than defense of his homeland—on orders from the Yugoslav Government-in-exile in, first, Cairo, then London—against the Axis and later Communist depredations by the pillaging Partisans of the Communist terrorist Tito. Acheson, then as now, was aware that the State Department, the OWI and OSS, were honeycombed with Communist and pro-Soviet employees.

Dean Gooderham Acheson, at the end of the 45-minute conference, firmly assured this correspondent, David Martin, and the designate-head of the United States airmen's mission that "everything possible will be done to insure that General Mihailovich will be liberated."

Mihailovich was machine-gunned to death, after his mock trial, a scant few weeks later. Research discloses that the extent of Acheson's intervention was a weakly worded aide memoire—very similar to the notes relating to the fate of William N. Oatis.

Much more than the fate of William N. Oatis is at stake presently, although the life of a working foreign correspondent should be enough to stir the State Department to action. The sworn affidavits of 37 United States airmen, representing more than 600 allied fliers, Americans, Scots, British, and Australians, attesting Mihailovich's loyalty, fell on completely deaf ears at the State Department, then located in the architectural monstrosity on Pennsylvania, now in "Foggy Bottom."

Despite the eloquent appeals and outraged editorials of leading American newspapers, the State Department and the White House have apparently done nothing but issue routine protests and threats of futile economic sanctions against, of all people, the Czechs.

William N. Oatis, Associated Press Correspondent, is a tortured prisoner of the Soviet Union. Seized by the MVD, tortured by their skilled and brutal agents, flung into solitary, beaten, drugged, and forced to a typical Soviet "confession"—this American citizen and newspaperman is nearing exhaustion and death today in a prison cell in Communist Czechoslovakia.

This correspondent is, admittedly, no Tom Paine. But we could use a Tom Paine right now, if we had one.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PUBLIC HEALTH HEALTH SERVICE—CONFIRMATIONS OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of nominations in the Public Health Service on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 14, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 13 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Frank G. Serrao, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Oren Ethelbert Long.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Charles S. Duncombe, of New Jersey, to the position of Examiner in Chief on the Board of Appeals of the United States Patent Office.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

William A. Mayberry	Richard M. Dillon
Francis L. Brittan	John W. Yager
Philip A. Hogue	Norman W. Bouchard
Eugene Carlson, Jr.	Gerard J. Perron
Paul R. Happel	Elliot S. Shafer
Edric S. Bates	

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Andrew F. Nixon	Francis H. Achard, Jr.
Forrest E. Stewart	Donald L. Savary, Jr.
William F. Maki	

The following-named person to be a chief boatswain in the United States Coast Guard:

Richard E. Walker

The following-named person to be a chief radio electrician in the United States Coast Guard:

George W. Rickles

The following-named persons to be chief machinists in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert J. Collins
Jessie S. Cockrell

The following-named person to be a chief pay clerk in the United States Coast Guard:
William E. Sparks

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton 2d, O154541, United States Army Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, O15788, United States Army.
Brig. Gen. Riley Finley Ennis, O11854, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15068, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Thomas Leonard Harrold, O16051, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180, United States Army.
Col. Herbert Maury Jones, O12251, United States Army.
Col. Alfred Eugene Kastner, O14932, United States Army.
Col. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966, United States Army.
Col. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, United States Army.
Col. Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., O15613, United States Army.
Col. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Earle Standlee, O16530, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. William Edward Shambora, O16540, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Don Longfellow, O16708, Medical Corps, United States Army.
Col. Martin Eugene Griffin, O16537, Medical Corps, United States Army.
Col. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546, Medical Corps, United States Army.
Col. James Ogilvie Gillespie, O16711, Medical Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Col. Neal Anthony Harper, O4025, Dental Corps, United States Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 13 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

Wilton L. Halverson

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

James J. Callaway	Elaine A. Schwinge
Seymour Levine	Ernest J. Carlson
Francis T. Flood	William M. Lordi
William P. Galen	James F. Alexander
Gerald W. Labiner	Sherman N. Kieffer
Ernest C. Siegfried	Charles S. McCammon
Nicholas L. Petrakis	Robert A. Mayer
Robert Schwartz	Rodrique A. Gravelle
John S. Shuttleworth	Sidney J. Curran
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr.	Eugene J. VanScott
Page H. Seekford	Charles J. Cherre
John D. Talbert	Vincent J. DePaulo

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

David C. Miller	Margaret S. Spies
Allan B. Carter	Leonard A. Lewis
Frank L. Weaver, Jr.	Cameron L. Self
Clyton R. Haberman	Donald W. Tharp
Warren H. Proudfoot	Bernard G. Keizer
David J. Crosby	Gordon F. Wise
Melvin R. Davis	

To be senior assistant sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Harold Lyons

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever blessed God, we thank Thee for this moment of prayer set apart for communion with the great Companion of our souls and the Counselor of our minds.

May we always feel the presence and power of Thy divine spirit, and begin each new day with the prayer, "What wilt Thou have me be and do?"

Grant that we may be inspired to give our best for the most helpful and noblest ways of serving our country and all mankind.

Make us trustworthy and faithful, as we aspire to stand in the glorious tradition of those who sought to do justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly with the Lord.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 10, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of

the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1214. An act to authorize and direct conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Florida to the St. Augustine port, waterway, and beach district.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3973, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, STIGLER, BATES of Kentucky, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, CANNON, and WIGGLESWORTH.

SUSPENDING IMPORT DUTIES ON LEAD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4948) to suspend certain import duties on lead.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman kindly explain the bill for the benefit of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill suspends the import duties on lead from the day following enactment of the bill until the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the present national emergency. The bill also contains a proviso whereby the President is required to revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead delivered at New York, has been below 16½ cents per pound.

The ceiling price on domestic lead is now 17 cents per pound. Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, the demand for lead in this country and in the world at large has increased rapidly. This has resulted in a shortage of lead. The United States depends on imports of lead for about one-third of its current requirements.

While the suspension of duties on lead will still not permit United States importers to meet the world price of lead, it is believed that imports will be increased and shortages alleviated to some extent due to the desire of foreign producers to earn dollars and to create or preserve their markets in this country.